DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 961 PS 029 920

AUTHOR	Seavey, Dorie; Sullivan, Ashley F.
TITLE	Household Food Security Study Summaries. 2001 Edition.
INSTITUTION	Brandeis Univ., Waltham, MA. Food Security Inst.
PUB DATE	2001-07-00
NOTE	103p.; The Center on Hunger and Poverty was formerly located at Tufts Univ., Medford, MA.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center on Hunger and Poverty, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, Mailstop 077, Waltham, MA 02454-9100. Tel: 781-736-8885; Fax: 781-736-3925; e-mail: hunger@brandeis.edu; Web site: http://www.centeronhunger.org.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	At Risk Persons; *Food; Foreign Countries; Incidence; *Low Income Groups; *Nutrition; Poverty; *Socioeconomic Status; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; *Food Security; United States

ABSTRACT

This report provides the most recent data on the food security of United States households. Based on studies using the Food Security Core Module (FSCM), a tool facilitating direct documentation of the extent of food insecurity and hunger caused by income limitations, this report summarizes 35 studies representing 20 states and Canada. The report is presented in three parts. Part 1 provides information on concepts, definitions, and resources related to food security measurement. Part 2 contains three indices to help readers locate material: (1) study location index; (2) population group/topic index; and (3) state index. Part 3 contains study summaries, each presented in two formats. The first provides information on the objectives, methods, and key findings and conclusions of the study along with information on obtaining the report. The second is a technical summary giving more detailed information on the instrument, methods, and implementation of the study. The technical summaries allow for comparisons across studies regarding specific issues. The preface to the report notes that there are now 5 consecutive years of national data on household food security and that state-level food security prevalence rates for 1996 to 1998 are available. In addition, specific at-risk populations are considered in a growing number of studies, including food stamp or welfare recipients, emergency food assistance recipients, legal immigrants, and general low-income populations. Finally, the locally initiated studies included in this report model the innovative collaborations between various non-profit organizations that make these studies feasible and maximize their impact on advocacy for improved local programs and policies. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 458 961

Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University

Household Food Security Study Summaries

2001 Edition

July 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Larry Brown
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty

PS 029920

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University

Household Food Security Study Summaries

2001 Edition

Dorie Seavey and Ashley F. Sullivan
July 2001

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty

The Center on Hunger and Poverty promotes policies that improve the lives and developmental capacities of low-income children and families in the nation. Established in 1990, the Center conducts applied research and policy analysis, disseminates analytic information on poverty and hunger, carries out public education initiatives, and provides assistance to policy makers and organizations across the country on poverty- and hunger-related issues.

The Center on Hunger and Poverty is part of The Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis University. The Center's programs are carried out through the Food Security Institute, the Asset Development Institute, and through a series of special projects.

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty
Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University
Mailstop 077
Waltham, MA 02454

Tel: 781-736-8885
Fax: 781-736-3925
URL: www.centeronhunger.org
Authors' E-mail:
seavey@brandeis.edu
afs@brandeis.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 1

Food Security Measurement: Concepts, Definitions, and Resources 3

Indices 8

- Study Location Index 8
- Population Group / Topic Index 12
- State Index 17

Study Summaries 18

- National Studies 18
- State and Local Studies 29
- Technical Summaries – National Studies 68
- Technical Summaries – State and Local Studies 74

PREFACE

Hunger and food insecurity are issues of persistent and pressing social concern in the United States as millions of American families experience food-related hardships due to insufficient resources. The promise of the food security measurement field is that better documentation of hunger will help focus attention on unmet food security needs in the nation, provide a sound basis for systematically monitoring progress addressing hunger, and ultimately help cultivate a climate conducive to effective policy solutions.

Since the launch of the first Food Security Supplement to the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey in 1995, the field of household food security measurement in the United States has accelerated rapidly. This has been made possible by the availability of a new, reliable and consistent household survey instrument – the USDA Food Security Core Module (FSCM). While still in the early stages of applied fieldwork, this new tool allows for direct documentation of the extent of food insecurity and hunger caused by income limitations, as these conditions are experienced and reported by households.

This document – the Food Security Institute's **2001 Edition** of **Household Food Security Study Summaries** – is testimony to the remarkable expansion of this field. In April 1999, the first edition of this publication covered seven studies that used the new instrument – one national report and six local studies. The current edition includes summaries of thirty-five studies (including the original seven). Nine of these are national in scope, fifteen have a statewide focus, two are multi-state, and an additional nine were conducted at the county or local level. Twenty states are represented by the studies in this report, a substantial increase from the five states covered by the studies extant in early 1999. Research in Canada is also included, as it was in the 1999 Edition.

Looking back over the last two years, several key developments in this field deserve highlighting. First, thanks to the yearly administration of the FSCM through the Current Population Survey, the United States now has five consecutive years of national data on household food security, with two more years under analysis (2000 and 2001). This has yielded a reliable set of national prevalence rates published annually by the USDA for both the general population as well as a variety of population subgroups and regions. These constitute an important set of national standard benchmark statistics against which state and local prevalence figures can be compared.

Second, using data collected in its national surveys, the USDA has calculated state-level food security prevalence rates for the period 1996 to 1998. These show that food insecurity and hunger vary considerably at the state level, with the prevalence of food insecurity ranging from a low of 4.5% of households in North Dakota to a high of 15% in New Mexico. The national rate for the same period was 9.7%. The state-level prevalence rates in turn serve an important benchmarking function for studies conducted at the local level within each state. They also allow for monitoring improvements or deterioration in food security within states, just as the national data allows for monitoring progress in eliminating hunger for the country as a whole.

Third, a growing number of studies document levels of food insecurity and hunger among specific at-risk populations in the United States, using the FSCM as a non-economic measure of a vital dimension of overall family well-being. Vulnerable groups studied include: food stamp recipients and welfare recipients (both current and former), emergency food assistance recipients, legal immigrants, and general low-income populations. A sufficient body of population-based studies now exists so that the 2001 Edition of Household Food Security Study Summaries provides an index organized by various population groups. In addition, we have also begun to track studies that address important methodological issues and developments in this field; five such studies are covered in this report.

Finally, special note should be made of the locally-initiated studies included in this publication. Local groups concerned with hunger in their communities have come together to document its extent and severity in Detroit, MI, Green Bay, WI, various counties in CA, Schenectady County, NY, and Hartford, CT. Several of these studies model the innovative types of collaborations between various kinds of non-profits – such as food banks, anti-hunger advocacy groups, social service agencies, and colleges and universities – that both make these studies feasible and maximize their impact on advocacy for improved local programs and policies.

How to Use this Report

This report provides three sets of indices designed to help readers locate material: 1) Study Location Index, 2) Population Group/Topic Index, and 3) State Index. The third index should be used to find out if studies have been conducted in a particular state. The second index can be used to identify studies completed to date that investigate the food security of a particular population group, for example, former welfare recipients. The first index gives a chronological listing of all the studies publicly released or published through May 2001, first at the national level and then at the state, county, or local levels.

Each study is summarized in two formats. The first is a brief summary that provides information on the objectives, methods, and key findings and conclusions of the study along with information on obtaining the report. The second is a "technical summary" which gives more detailed information on the instrument, methods, and implementation of the study. Technical summaries allow for comparisons across studies regarding specific issues such as whether or not the survey instrument was translated, types of survey locations, and sampling design. Special features of each study also are noted.

Every attempt has been made to track down all the studies publicly released or published in this field. Please bring to our attention any studies that we may have missed as well as any corrections to the information presented.

Visit our website (www.centeronhunger.org) to find this report on-line and for electronic links, where they exist, to the reports summarized herein. As they are released, we will continue to post new reports on our on-line study indices. In addition, our website provides state-by-state statistics on household food insecurity and hunger as well as links to many valuable USDA resources and materials. Finally, our on-line national clearinghouse also maintains a comprehensive, up-to-date database of hunger studies conducted across the country using methods *other than* the USDA instrument. A separate FSI report released last year presents summaries of these studies conducted between May 1998 and August 2000 (*Hunger in the United States: A Summary of Recent Studies on Hunger and Emergency Food Demand*, August 2000).

Dorie Seavey, Ph.D.
Director, Food Security Institute

Food Security Measurement

FOOD SECURITY MEASUREMENT: CONCEPTS, DEFINITIONS, AND RESOURCES

Food Security Definitions and Concepts

Extensive research has led to the following definitions, which are foundational to the new food security measurement paradigm.[1]

- **Food security** refers to access to enough food at all times for an active and healthy life. At a minimum, food security includes: the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways (without resorting to emergency food supplies, scavenging, stealing, or other coping strategies, for example).
- **Food insecurity** occurs whenever the availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, or the ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways, is limited or uncertain.
- **Hunger** is the uneasy or painful sensation caused by a recurrent or involuntary lack of food and is a potential, although not necessary, consequence of food insecurity. Over time, hunger may result in malnutrition.

These concepts are based on research showing that households typically adopt a series of coping strategies in response to food insecurity. The continuum of coping strategies begins with anxiety about food insufficiency, leading to decisions to reduce the household food budget by altering the quality or variety of food consumed. As the situation worsens, adults in the household begin to experience hunger due to reduced food intake, and in the most severe situations, both children and adults experience hunger.

The USDA Food Security Measure

Derived from the new food security paradigm, the USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM) consists of an 18-item household survey instrument constructed as a scale measure (a copy of the instrument can be found at the end of this section). It aims to measure only food insecurity and hunger resulting from the inability to afford enough food. The FSCM asks about a household's experiences of increasingly severe circumstances of food insufficiency and behaviors undertaken in response to them during the 12-month period preceding the survey. The least severe items ask whether the household has worried about or experienced a situation where food was running out, and there was no money to buy more. The most severe items indicate reduced food intake and hunger for children in the household or more severe hunger for adults.

The FSCM was developed in response to the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 and involved considerable collaborative effort by private non-government experts, academic researchers, and a Federal interagency working group, with leadership from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health and Human Services. It was designed to meet the need for a valid operational measure of hunger in the United States that could serve as a standard instrument for gauging the prevalence of food insecurity and hunger at the local, state and national levels. Extensive analysis and testing by USDA and private researchers has established a standardized methodology for scaling the set of 18 questions to provide a valid and reliable measure of the severity of food insecurity and hunger in each household. The FSCM was used for the first time in the 1995 Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) and has been administered annually thereafter to a nationally representative sample of households as a supplement to the CPS.

---

[1] These definitions were published in 1990 by the Life Sciences Research Office (LSRO) of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.

Defining Levels of Food Insecurity and Hunger

Based on its overall pattern of response to all 18 questions, each household is classified into one of the following four food security status categories:

1. **Food Secure**: The household shows no or minimal evidence of food insecurity.
2. **Food Insecure without Hunger**: Food insecurity is evident in the household's concerns and in its adjustments to household food management, including reduced diet quality. Little or no reduction in household members' food intake is reported.
3. **Food Insecure with Moderate Hunger Evident**: Food intake for adults in the household has been reduced to an extent that implies that adults have repeatedly experienced the physical sensation of hunger. Such reductions are not observed at this stage for children in the household.
4. **Food Insecure with Severe Hunger Evident**: A household with children has reduced the children's food intake to an extent that implies that the children have experienced the physical sensation of hunger. Adults in the household (with and without children) have repeatedly experienced more extensive reductions in food intake.

The proportion of households in these four categories are then used to estimate the prevalence of food security, food insecurity, and hunger.

The "Short Form"

Using the full scale is sometimes difficult for research efforts with time and/or financial constraints. An abbreviated 6-item scale has been developed by researchers at the National Center for Health Statistics (Blumberg, 1999) for these situations. The 6 items are a subset of the full 18-item version and, like the full scale, capture a range of household responses to inadequate resources for food. The short version of the scale classifies respondents into one of three categories: food secure, food insecure without hunger, and food insecure with hunger. The main weakness of the 6-item measure, relative to the full scale, is that it does not allow for the separation of the moderate and severe hunger categories because it is unable to distinguish between the most severe cases in which children are going hungry from those cases in which adults have cut their food consumption.

QUESTIONS INCLUDED IN THE 18-ITEM FOOD SECURITY CORE MODULE (FSCM)

1. "I *worried whether our food would run out* before we got money to buy more." Was that often, sometimes or never true for you in the last 12 months?

2. "The *food that we bought just didn't last* and we didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes or never true for you in the last 12 months?

3. "We *couldn't afford to eat balanced meals.*" Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

4. "We *relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed the children* because we were running out of money to buy food." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

5. "We *couldn't feed the children a balanced meal* because we couldn't afford that." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

6. "The *children were not eating enough* because we just couldn't afford enough food." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

7. In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever *cut the size of your meals or skip meals* because there wasn't enough money for food?

8. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only one or two months?

9. In the last 12 months, did you ever *eat less than you felt you should* because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

10. In the last 12 months, were you ever *hungry but didn't eat* because you couldn't afford enough food?

11. Sometimes people lose weight because they don't have enough to eat. In the last 12 months, did you lose weight because there wasn't enough food?

12. In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever *not eat for a whole day* because there wasn't enough money for food?

13. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only one or two months?

14. In the last 12 months, did you ever *cut the size of any of the children's meals* because there wasn't enough money for food?

15. In the last 12 months, did any of the *children ever skip meals* because there wasn't enough money for food?

16. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only one or two months?

17. In the last 12 months, were the *children ever hungry* but you just couldn't afford more food?

18. In the last 12 months, did any of the *children ever not eat for a whole day* because there wasn't enough money or food?

QUESTIONS INCLUDED IN THE "SHORT FORM" (6-ITEM FOOD SECURITY CORE MODULE)

1. "The food that [I/we] bought just didn't last, and [I/we] didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?
2. "[I/We] couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?
3. In the last 12 months, did you (or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?
4. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?
5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?
6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

RESOURCES ON FOOD SECURITY MEASUREMENT

Andrews, Margaret, Mark Nord, Gary Bickel, and Steven Carlson (Fall 2000). *Household Food Security in the United States, 1999.* Washington, DC: Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 8 (FANRR-8). Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr8/.

Andrews, Margaret S. and Mark A. Prell, Eds. (February 2001) *Second Food Security Measurement and Research Conference, Volume I: Proceedings.* Washington, DC: Food and Rural Economics Division, Economics Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food Assistance and Nutritional Research Report No. 11-1. Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/Fanrr11-1/.

Bickel, Gary, Steven Carlson, and Mark Nord (July 1999). *Household Food Security in the United States 1995-1998 (Advance Report).* Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/foodsec98.PDF.

Bickel, Gary, Mark Nord, Cristofer Price, William Hamilton, and John Cook (March 2000). *Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000.* Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/FSEC/FILES/FSGuide.pdf.

Blumberg Stephen J., Karil Bialostosky, William L. Hamilton, and Ronette R. Briefel. "The Effectiveness of a Short Form of the Household Food Security Scale." *American Journal of Public Health.* August 1999, Vol. 89, No. 8: 1231-1234.

Carlson, Steven J., Margaret S. Andrews, and Gary W. Bickel. "Measuring Food Insecurity and Hunger in the United States: Development of a National Benchmark Measure and Prevalence Estimates." *Journal of Nutrition.* February 1999, Vol. 129: 1S-7S (Supplement).

Hamilton, William L., John T. Cook, William W. Thompson, Lawrence F. Buron, Edward A. Frongillo, Jr., Christine M. Olson, and Cheryl A. Wehler (September 1997). *Household Food Security in the United States 1995 - Summary Report of the Food Security Measurement Project.* Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/fsp/files/sumrpt.pdf.

Nord, Mark, Kyle Jemison, and Gary Bickel (September 1999). *Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, by State, 1996-98.* Washington, DC: Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 2 (FANRR-2). Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/epubs/pdf/fanrr2/fanrr2.pdf.

* * * *

For additional references and technical information related to food security measurement, see the web sites of the Food Security Institute at the Center on Hunger and Poverty (http://www.centeronhunger.org) and the USDA's Food Security Briefing Room (http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/FoodSecurity/).

Indices

STUDY LOCATION INDEX

Food Security Studies
Using the USDA Household Survey Instrument
1997 – May 2001

Title	*Date*	*Page No.*[*]
National Studies		
1995 Federal Food Security Study *Food and Consumer Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 1997	18 (68)
Food Stamp Participants' Food Security and Nutrient Availability *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	July 1999	19 (68)
Household Food Security in the United States, 1995-1998 (Advance Report) *Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	July 1999	20 (70)
Effectiveness of a Short Form of the Household Food Security Scale *National Center for Health Statistics and Abt Associates, Inc.*	August 1999	21 (70)
Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, By State, 1996-1998 / Addendum: How Many Households? How Many People *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 1999 / August 2000	22 (71)
Does it Cost Less to Live in Rural Areas? Evidence from New Data on Food Security and Hunger *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture and the University of Wisconsin-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences*	March 2000	23 (71)
Does the Decline in Food Stamp Use by Rural Low-Income Households Represent Less Need or Less Access? Evidence from New Data on Food Insecurity and Hunger *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 2000	25 (72)
Household Food Security in the United States, 1999 *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 2000	27 (72)
Prevalence of Hunger Declines in Rural Households *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	December 2000	28 (73)

---

[*] Page numbers for technical summaries noted in parenthesis.

State and Local Studies

Representative Neighborhood of Detroit: A Pilot Study of Food Security Status *Hunger Action Coalition of Michigan*	March 1998	29 (74)
Legal Immigrant Households in Two California Counties: The Impact of Food Stamp Cuts *California Food Policy Advocates*	May 1998	30 (74)
At-Risk Households in Green Bay, Wisconsin *Brown County Food and Hunger Network and University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension*	May 1998	32 (75)
Persons Receiving Emergency Food in 12 California Counties *California Food Policy Advocates*	June 1998	33 (75)
Household Food Insecurity and Hunger among Families Using Food Banks (two articles) (Canada) *University of Toronto*	March/April 1999	34 (76)
Hunger in Kansas *Kansas Health Institute*	August 1999	36 (76)
Food Security Survey of At-Risk Households in Green Bay, Wisconsin – Spring 1999 *University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay*	September 1999	37 (77)
From Welfare Reliance to Wage Work: A Report on Food Security among Louisiana's Rural Welfare Population *Louisiana State University School of Human Ecology*	October 1999	39 (77)
The Rhode Island Food Security Measurement Project – Assessing the Prevalence of Hunger and Food Insecurity in Rhode Island *Rhode Island Department of Health*	November 1999	40 (78)
Face Validity of the Core Food Security Module with Asians and Pacific Islanders (HI) *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	January / February 2000	41 (78)

Concurrent Validity of the Face Valid Food Security Measure (HI) *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	March 2000	42 (79)
Food Security and Hunger in Poor, Mother-Headed Families in Four U.S. Cities (OH, CA, FL, PA) *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*	May 2000	44 (79)
Calaveras County, California Hunger Report 2000: Voices of the People *Human Resources Council, Inc. and University of California Cooperative Extension*	August 2000	46 (81)
Hungry at Home: A Study of Food Insecurity and Hunger among Legal Immigrants in the United States *Physicians for Human Rights (See summary of "Hunger in Legal Immigrants: California, Texas, and Illinois," October 2000)*	August 2000	47 (81)
Hunger in Legal Immigrants: California, Texas, and Illinois *Boston Medical Center, Natividad Medical Center, and Weiss Memorial Hospital*	October 2000	47 (81)
Leaving Welfare Behind: The Oklahoma TANF Leavers Report *Oklahoma Department of Human Services*	October 2000	48 (82)
Profiles of Poverty and Hunger in Oregon 2000 *Oregon Food Bank*	October 2000	49 (82)
After Time Limits: A Study of Households Leaving Welfare between December 1998 and April 1999 (MA) *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance*	November 2000	50 (84)
Current and Former Work First New Jersey Clients: How Are They Faring 30 Months Later? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	November 2000	52 (84)
Independent Validation of the Core Food Security Module with Asians and Pacific Islanders (two articles) (HI) *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI, Colorado State University, and University of HI at Manoa*	November 2000 / March 2001	53 (79)
The Family Transition Program: Final Report on Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*	December 2000	55 (86)

Study of Arizona Adults Leaving the Food Stamp Program *Abt Associates, Inc.*	December 2000	56 (86)
Food Stamp Leavers in Illinois – How Are They Doing Two Years Later? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	January 2001	57 (87)
The Rhode Island Food Security Measurement Project – Assessing the Prevalence of Hunger and Food Insecurity in Rhode Island, Year 2000 Summary Report *Rhode Island Department of Health*	January 2001	59 (87)
2000 Oregon Population Survey *Office of Economic Analysis, Oregon Department of Administrative Services and Oregon Progress Board*	January 2001	60 (88)
Iowa Families that Left TANF: Why Did They Leave and How Are They Faring? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	February 2001	61 (88)
Hunger in Schenectady County (NY) *Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.*	March 2001	62 (89)
Monitoring Outcomes for Cuyahoga County's Welfare Leavers: How Are They Faring? (OH) *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Case Western Reserve University*	April 2001	64 (89)
Food Security and Community: Putting the Pieces Together (CT) *Hartford Food System*	May 2001	66 (91)

POPULATION GROUP / TOPIC INDEX

Food Security Studies
Using the USDA Household Survey Instrument
1997 – May 2001

Title	*Date*	*Page No.*
General Population Studies		
1995 Federal Food Security Study *Food and Consumer Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 1997	18 (68)
Representative Neighborhood of Detroit: A Pilot Study of Food Security Status *Hunger Action Coalition of Michigan*	March 1998	29 (74)
Household Food Security in the United States, 1995-1998 (Advance Report) *Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	July 1999	20 (70)
Hunger in Kansas *Kansas Health Institute*	August 1999	36 (76)
Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, By State, 1996-1998 / Addendum: How Many Households? How Many People? *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 1999 / August 2000	22 (71)
Concurrent Validity of the Face Valid Food Security Measure (HI) (also in "Methodological Research" and "Emergency Food Recipients") *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	March 2000	42 (79)
Household Food Security in the United States, 1999 *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 2000	27 (72)
Prevalence of Hunger Declines in Rural Households *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	December 2000	28 (73)
2000 Oregon Population Survey *Office of Economic Analysis, Oregon Department of Administrative Services and Oregon Progress Board*	January 2001	60 (88)

Hunger in Schenectady County (also in "Emergency Food Recipients") *Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.*	March 2001	62 (89)

Current or Former Food Stamp Recipients

Legal Immigrant Households in Two California Counties: The Impact of Food Stamp Cuts (also in "Legal Immigrants") *California Food Policy Advocates*	May 1998	30 (74)
Food Stamp Participants' Food Security and Nutrient Availability *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	July 1999	19 (68)
Does the Decline in Food Stamp Use by Rural Low-Income Households Represent Less Need or Less Access? Evidence from New Data on Food Insecurity and Hunger *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*	September 2000	25 (72)
Study Of Arizona Adults Leaving The Food Stamp Program *Abt Associates, Inc.*	December 2000	56 (86)
Food Stamp Leavers in Illinois – How Are They Doing Two Years Later? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	January 2001	57 (87)

Current or Former Welfare Recipients

From Welfare Reliance to Wage Work: A Report on Food Security among Louisiana's Rural Welfare Population *Louisiana State University School of Human Ecology*	October 1999	39 (77)
Food Security and Hunger in Poor, Mother-Headed Families in Four U.S. Cities (OH, CA, FL, PA) *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*	May 2000	44 (79)
Leaving Welfare Behind: The Oklahoma TANF Leavers Report (also in "Low-Income Populations") *Oklahoma Department of Human Services*	October 2000	48 (82)

After Time Limits: A Study of Households Leaving Welfare between December 1998 and April 1999 (MA) Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance	November 2000	50 (84)
Current and Former Work First New Jersey Clients: How Are They Faring 30 Months Later? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	November 2000	52 (84)
The Family Transition Program: Final Report on Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*	December 2000	55 (86)
Iowa Families that Left TANF: Why Did They Leave and How Are They Faring? *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*	February 2001	61 (88)
Monitoring Outcomes for Cuyahoga County's Welfare Leavers: How Are They Faring? (OH) *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Case Western Reserve University*	April 2001	64 (89)

Legal Immigrants

Legal Immigrant Households in Two California Counties: The Impact of Food Stamp Cuts (also in "Current or Former Food Stamp Recipients") *California Food Policy Advocates*	May 1998	30 (74)
Persons Receiving Emergency Food in 12 California Counties (also in "Emergency Food Recipients") *California Food Policy Advocates*	June 1998	33 (75)
Hungry at Home: A Study of Food Insecurity and Hunger among Legal Immigrants in the United States *Physicians for Human Rights (See summary of "Hunger in Legal Immigrants: California, Texas, and Illinois," October 2000)*	August 2000	47 (81)
Hunger in Legal Immigrants in California, Texas, and Illinois *Boston Medical Center, Natividad Medical Center, and Weiss Memorial Hospital*	October 2000	47 (81)

Emergency Food Recipients

Persons Receiving Emergency Food in 12 California Counties (also in "Legal Immigrants") *California Food Policy Advocates*	June 1998	33 (75)
Household Food Insecurity and Hunger among Families Using Food Banks (two articles) (Canada) *University of Toronto*	March/April 1999	34 (76)
Concurrent Validity of the Face Valid Food Security Measure (HI) (also in "General Population Studies" and "Methodological Research") *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	March 2000	42 (79)
Calaveras County, California Hunger Report 2000: Voices of the People *Human Resources Council, Inc. and University of California Cooperative Extension*	August 2000	46 (81)
Hunger in Schenectady County (also in "General Population Studies") *Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.*	March 2001	62 (89)
Profiles of Poverty and Hunger in Oregon 2000 *Oregon Food Bank*	October 2000	49 (82)

Low-Income Populations

At-Risk Households in Green Bay, Wisconsin *Brown County Food and Hunger Network and University of Wisconsin Extension*	May 1998	32 (75)
Food Security Survey of At-Risk Households in Green Bay, Wisconsin – Spring 1999 *University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay*	September 1999	37 (77)
The Rhode Island Food Security Measurement Project – Assessing the Prevalence of Hunger and Food Insecurity in Rhode Island *Rhode Island Department of Health*	November 1999	40 (78)
Leaving Welfare Behind: The Oklahoma TANF Leavers Report (also in "Current or Former Welfare Recipients") *Oklahoma Department of Human Services*	October 2000	48 (82)

Rhode Island Food Security Measurement Project – Assessing the Prevalence of Hunger and Food Insecurity in Rhode Island, Year 2000 Summary Report *Rhode Island Department of Health*	January 2001	59 (87)
Food Security and Community: Putting the Pieces Together (CT) *Hartford Food System*	May 2001	66 (91)

Methodological Research

Effectiveness of a Short Form of the Household Food Security Scale *National Center for Health Statistics and Abt Associates, Inc.*	August 1999	21 (70)
Face Validity of the Core Food Security Module with Asians and Pacific Islanders (HI) *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	January / February 2000	41 (78)
Concurrent Validity of the Face Valid Food Security Measure (HI) (also in "General Population Studies" and "Emergency Food Recipients") *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University*	March 2000	42 (79)
Does it Cost Less to Live in Rural Areas? Evidence from New Data on Food Security and Hunger *Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture and University of Wisconsin-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences*	March 2000	23 (71)
Independent Validation of the Core Food Security Module with Asians and Pacific Islanders (two articles) (HI) *Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI, Colorado State University, and University of HI at Manoa*	November 2000 / March 2001	53 (79)

STATE INDEX

State	Page Numbers
Arizona	56
California	30, 33, 44, 46, 47
Connecticut	66
Florida	44, 55
Hawaii	41, 42, 53
Illinois	47, 57
Iowa	61
Kansas	36
Louisiana	39
Massachusetts	50
Michigan	29
New Jersey	52
New York	62
Ohio	44, 64
Oklahoma	48
Oregon	49, 60
Pennsylvania	44
Rhode Island	40, 59
Texas	47
Wisconsin	32, 37
Non-U.S.	
Canada	34

National Food Security Study Summaries

1995 FEDERAL FOOD SECURITY STUDY

September 1997

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Abt Associates, Tufts University Center on Hunger and Poverty, Cornell University Division of Nutritional Sciences, and C.A.W and Associates

Objective	To develop measures of food insecurity and hunger, and to apply those measures to produce estimates of the prevalences of food insecurity and hunger in the U.S. population.
Location and Survey Period	National survey conducted in April 1995 by the U.S. Census Bureau concerning prior 12-month and 30-day periods.
Sample	44,730 households
Study Design	Large battery of food security items administered as first Food Security Supplement to regular Current Population Survey (CPS) of Census Bureau. FSCM constituted a systematic set of 18 questions with strongest statistical properties.
Key Food Security Findings	• 11.9% of households sampled (or an estimated 11.94 million households in the United States) experienced food insecurity during the 12 months prior to the April 1995. • 7.78 million (7.8% of all households) experienced food insecurity without hunger; 3.34 million experienced food insecurity with moderate (mainly adult) hunger; and 0.82 million households experienced food security with severe hunger evident. • Overall, 4.16 million households (4.1%) experienced some level of hunger. • Food insecurity is clearly related to income and poverty but the relationship is not exact: not all poor households are food insecure, and only a small percentage of households with below-poverty incomes experience actual hunger (13.1%). More than a third of poor households are classified as food insecure, whereas only 8% with above-poverty incomes are food insecure, and most of those have near-poverty incomes.
Conclusions	• Household survey data can be used to produce valid and reliable measures of food insecurity and hunger for the U.S. population at several demographic and economic sublevels. • The new CPS food security data provide a broad new assessment and monitoring tool for policymakers and administrators of government food assistance programs at all levels.
Contact Information	**Available at:** http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/menu/research/Published/fsp/fsp.htm **Study authors:** William L. Hamilton, Project Director, John T. Cook, Principal Investigator, William W. Thompson, Lawrence F. Buron, Edward A. Frongillo, Jr., Christin M. Olson, Cheryl A. Wehler Study consists of 3 reports: Summary Report, Technical Report, Guide to Implementing the Core Food Security Module

FOOD STAMP PARTICIPANTS' FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY

July 1999

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Objective	To assess how well the Food Stamp Program (FSP) is serving its current and potential clients by examining the food security and nutrient availability of participants using data from the 1996 National Food Stamp Program Survey (NFSPS).
Location and Survey Period	National June 1996 - January 1997
Sample	2,454 households participating in the FSP and 855 households not participating (450 FSP-eligible and 405 near-eligible).
Study Design	The study uses 2 main measurement constructs: the FSCM to assess household food security and a 7-day food use record to assess household nutrient availability. The former was administered to all household respondents in the sample and the latter was collected for roughly half of the FSP participants.
Key Food Security Findings	• Nationally, 50% of FSP participants experienced some level of food insecurity and 22% were classified as experiencing some hunger (28% were classified as food insecure without hunger; 17% as food insecure with moderate hunger; and 5% as food insecure with severe hunger). • Food security was lower among FSP participants than among the two nonparticipant groups, both of which had higher average incomes. However, substantial numbers of eligible and near-eligible nonparticipants also experienced some degree of food insecurity (34% and 25%, respectively). • Substantial numbers of food-insecure households reported putting off paying bills (percentages ranged from 58% to 85%) and borrowing money or food (35% - 85%) as coping mechanisms. Use of emergency food sources was also frequently cited, especially by FSP participants. • With the exception of the presence of an elderly person in the household, household characteristics did not appear to substantially influence food security levels. Households with an elderly person were more likely to be food secure. • Food stamp benefits were associated with increased levels of nutrient availability. Average nutrient availability for FSP respondents exceeded Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDAs) for all of the nutrients examined; however, the averages mask substantial percentages of households with nutrient availabilities below RDAs. For example, nearly one-third of households surveyed did not meet 100% of the iron RDA. • The relationship between food security and variables measuring store access were generally quite weak, although access to a car was clearly associated with greater food security. • An unexpected positive correlation was found between FSP household hunger and nutrient availability: households classified as experiencing hunger tended to have higher levels of nutrient availability than those not indicating hunger. Several possible explanatory factors requiring further investigation are offered.
Conclusions	• Compared to the overall U.S. population, food insecurity is much more prevalent and severe among all the groups studied. • Food stamp benefits appear to have a positive impact on household nutrient availability. • The statistical and conceptual relationship between nutrient intake and food insecurity may be more complicated than previously realized. Further investigation is necessary.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/nutrient.pdf **Study authors**: Barbara Cohen, James Ohls, Margaret Andrews, Michael Ponza, Lorenzo Moreno, Amy Zambrowski, Rhoda Cohen

HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES, 1995-1998 (ADVANCE REPORT)

July 1999

Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To estimate the prevalence of U.S. hunger and food insecurity in the United States for the period 1995 – 1998 using comparable data and consistent methods across the four years.
Location and Survey Period	National April 1995, September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998
Sample	About 40,000 households in each survey period completing the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design	• Prevalence estimates calculated from FSCM data from the Food Security Supplement. • Figures were adjusted to permit cross-year comparisons (the main adjustment was the application of common screening criteria to each year's data). This adjustment understates the true food insecurity prevalence; prevalence estimates for hunger are less affected.
Key Food Security Findings	• In 1998, an estimated 10.5 million households (10.2% of all households) were food insecure. Approximately 36 million people lived in these households, with children accounting for nearly 40% of this group (or about 14 million children under age 18). • From 1995 to 1998, overall food insecurity prevalence changed negligibly (10.3% in 1995 and 10.2% in 1998). The trend over the period shows household food security improving through 1997, then declining in the 12 months ending August 1998. • In 1998, 3.6% of all households were food insecure with hunger, a slight decline from 3.9% in 1995. • The national food insecurity prevalence in 1998 was substantially exceeded in high-risk groups such as: single-women headed households with children (31.9%), Hispanic and Black households generally (21.8% and 20.7% respectively), and households with incomes below the poverty line (35.4%). • The national hunger prevalence – 3.6% in 1998 – was exceeded by households headed by single women (5.6%), men living alone (5.6%), Black and Hispanic households (8.2% and 6.7%, respectively), households below the poverty line (13.5%), central-city households (5.6%), and households in the South and West (4.0% and 4.2%, respectively). • In 1998, households with children experienced food insecurity at more than double the rate for households without children (15.2% vs. 7.2%). • Below average hunger prevalence occurred in households with elderly (1.8%), married-couple households with children (2.0%), White, non-Hispanic households (2.5%), and households at or above 185% of the poverty line (1.2%).
Conclusions	• Between 1995 and 1998, there was virtually no overall change in the prevalence of food insecurity and evidence of some improvement in the more severe range of food insecurity. • Some households are at much greater risk of hunger than others, including households with children especially those led by single women, minorities, and households with income below the official poverty line.
Contact Information	**Note: In September 1999, the USDA released "Errata, Table 1 *Household Food Security in the United States, 1995-1998: Advance Report*," which corrects the published food security estimates for *individuals* in 1998. The originally reported *household* statistics are correct.** **Report available at:** http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/foodsec98.PDF **Errata available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/foodsecurity/lit/Adv9598e.pdf **Study authors:** Gary Bickel, Steven Carlson, Mark Nord Data for 1995-1997 prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. 1998 data prepared by Mark Nord.

THE EFFECTIVNESS OF A SHORT FORM OF THE HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY SCALE

August 1999

National Center for Health Statistics and Abt Associates, Inc.

Objective	To determine whether an abbreviated version ("short form") of the 18-item FSCM is sufficiently valid to implement when time and financial constraints preclude the use of the full scale.
Location and Survey Period	National April 1995
Sample	44,647 households that completed the Food Security Supplement to the April 1995 Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the Census Bureau for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design	Short-form items selected by: (1) eliminating 8 items applicable only to households with children; (2) excluding 3 items associated with distinguishing between the 2 most severe categories of food insecurity; (3) including least severe items identifying 2 categories of food insecurity (food insecurity without hunger and food insecurity with hunger); and (4) choosing 3 additional items from remaining 4 items by determining subset with smallest average bias and strongest concordance.
Key Food Security Findings	• While the possible subsets of 6 items did not differ dramatically in their ability to generate accurate population prevalence estimates, the one selected displayed the smallest average bias and strongest concordance (items 2,3,5,7,8, and 10). • The selected short form correctly identified the level of food security for 97.7% of households and 87.2% of all households in which respondents answered at least 1 item affirmatively on the full scale (n=8003).
Conclusions	• The short form is robust for classifying household food security in general populations when survey resources do not permit use of the full scale. • The short form cannot measure the more severe levels of food insecurity at which child hunger is generally observed, and cannot, therefore, identify households where child hunger has been experienced and reported. • While the short form appears to be relatively unbiased in a general sample of the national population, the accuracy and bias of this measure may be quite different in special populations that deviate from the 1995 national population.
Contact Information	**Study published as:** "The Effectiveness of a Short Form of the Household Food Security Scale." *American Journal of Public Health.* August 1999, Vol. 89, No. 8: 1231-1234. **Contact:** Stephen J. Blumberg, National Center for Health Statistics, Division of Health Interview Statistics, 6525 Belcrest Road, Room 850, Hyattsville, MD 20782, E-mail: swb5@cdc.gov **Study authors:** Stephen J. Blumberg, Karil Bialostosky, William L. Hamilton, Ronette R. Briefel

PREVALENCE OF FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER, BY STATE, 1996-1998

September 1999

Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To present state estimates of the prevalence of food insecurity and hunger and assess state-level prevalence variation by geographic location, poverty, and food stamp use.
Location and Survey Period	All 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, 1996-1998 September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998
Sample	About 40,000 households in each survey period completing the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design and Sample	• State food security prevalence estimates calculated from FSCM data from the Food Security Supplements. • Prevalences averaged over 3 years because annual estimates can have large margins of error due to the limited number of households surveyed in each state.
Key Food Security Findings	• While 9.7% of U.S. households were classified as food insecure in 1996-1998, the prevalence of food insecurity ranged from 4.6% in North Dakota to 15.1% in New Mexico. States with the highest levels of food insecurity formed an arc bordering the Pacific Ocean, Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico, while states with the lowest rates were mostly from the Midwest, Great Lakes, and New England. • States with high rates of food insecure households included: MS, TX, AZ, LA, AR, OR, OK, WA, FL, and CA. States with low rates included: MA, SD, DE, MN, IA, PA, MD, WI, NJ, NH, and NE. • Hunger prevalence ranged from 1.4% of households in North Dakota to 5.8% in Oregon. The incidence of hunger was significantly above the national average in 6 states: AR, FL, NM, OR, TX, WA, and the District of Columbia. • Although food insecurity is closely linked with poverty, this association is not perfect. For some states, differences in poverty and food insecurity rates were "substantial and unexpected." For example, although Kentucky and South Dakota had higher than average poverty rates, their food insecurity prevalence was below the national average in all three years. In contrast, Washington and Oregon had poverty rates below the national average yet had food insecurity prevalences well above the national average. • With the exception of Vermont, Michigan, and Kentucky, states with a food insecurity prevalence below the national average also had food stamp use below the national average; however, the association between food stamp use and food insecurity was not as strong among high food insecurity states. • The Addendum provides answers to frequently asked questions concerning the number of households interviewed in each state, the number of food insecure households, and the number of people living in food insecure households.
Conclusions	• Levels of food insecurity and hunger vary considerably among States. • High food insecurity states generally had higher than average poverty rates and higher than average use of food stamps, but there were some notable exceptions. These exceptions, along with the geographic pattern of food insecurity prevalence require further analysis.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/epubs/pdf/fanrr2/index.htm (Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 2) **Addendum "How Many Households? How Many People?" available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/foodsecurity/states9698a.htm (released August 2000) **Contact:** Mark Nord, Economic Research Service, 1800 M Street NW, Room 2068, Washington, DC 20036-5831; Tel: 202-694-5433; E-mail: marknord@econ.ag.gov **Study authors:** Mark Nord, Kyle Jemison, Gary Bickel

DOES IT COST LESS TO LIVE IN RURAL AREAS? EVIDENCE FROM NEW DATA ON FOOD SECURITY AND HUNGER

March 2000

Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To determine if the USDA food security measure can provide a basis for estimating cost-of-living differences across regions and between rural and urban areas, and to compare this set of adjustors to that developed by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), which is based on geographic housing cost differences.
Location and Survey Period	National March and April 1995
Sample	20,698 households (14,146 from urban areas, 6,552 from rural areas)
Study Design	• Two underlying assumptions are operative: a) households reporting similar levels of difficulty obtaining enough food have, on average, similar levels of well-being, and b) differences in nominal income-to-poverty ratios are attributable to differences in cost of living if well-being is held constant. • Data on food security are from the April 1995 Current Population Survey (CPS); data on income and poverty are from the March 1995 CPS (matched files). • Household food security status was calculated as a continuous measure. Income was adjusted for family size and receipt of public assistance by calculating the ratio of household income to the household's poverty threshold. Income defined as cash income (including cash welfare), earned income tax credit, and market value of food stamps, school lunches, housing subsidies, and energy assistance. Dummy variables created for major race-ethnic groups and household structure. • Households assigned to appropriate metro-size and census division category based on Metropolitan Statistical Areas/Federal Information Processing Standards code and state of residence. • Households categorized by metro status and income-to-poverty ratios (in ranges); mean food insecurity for each category calculated. If the cost of living is lower in rural areas, food insecurity should be less severe in rural than in urban households at similar levels of income.
Key Findings	• The association between income and food insecurity, controlling for race/ethnicity and household structure, took the expected form – households with income below the poverty level had the highest mean food insecurity. This association was statistically significant, although weaker than expected. • At all income levels up to 5 times the poverty level, food insecurity was higher in metro households. At any fixed level of food insecurity from 1.2 – 1.8 (the range corresponding to incomes around the poverty threshold), urban and rural income-to-poverty ratios differed by about 0.20, suggesting that the mean cost of living for households in this income range was about 20% higher in metro than in nonmetro areas. • In general, average cost of living (based on equivalent food security) varied substantially across space and was generally 16% lower in nonmetro areas compared to metro areas. Across nonmetro regions, cost of living varied greatly but across metro areas, there was little variation. • The NAS adjustors systematically overadjust for cost of living, producing estimates too high in high costs-of-living areas and too low in low cost-of-living areas.
Conclusions	• The new food security/hunger measure can provide information on differences in cost of living across regions and along the rural-urban continuum, and should not be overlooked as a potentially useful tool in adjusting poverty thresholds to fit geographic differences in cost of living. • The findings raise serious questions about the appropriateness of adjusting poverty thresholds solely on the basis of cost-of-housing information, as proposed by NAS, and indicate the importance of developing a method for geographic adjustment of poverty thresholds that takes into account the costs of the full low-income market basket as well as housing costs.

DOES IT COST LESS TO LIVE IN RURAL AREAS? EVIDENCE FROM NEW DATA ON FOOD SECURITY AND HUNGER

March 2000

Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Contact Information	**Study published as:** "Does It Cost Less to Live in Rural Areas? Evidence from New Data on Food Security and Hunger," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 65, No. 1: 104-125. **Contact:** Mark Nord, Economic Research Service, 1800 M Street NW, Room 2068, Washington, DC 20036-5831; Tel: 202-694-5433; E-mail: marknord@econ.ag.gov **Study author:** Mark Nord

DOES THE DECLINE IN FOOD STAMP USE BY RURAL LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS REPRESENT LESS NEED OR LESS ACCESS? EVIDENCE FROM NEW DATA ON FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER

September 2000

Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To determine whether the decline in food stamp caseloads resulted from reduced need or reduced access by analyzing changes in food insecurity and hunger prevalence among low-income households nationally and within rural (nonmetro) areas.
Location and Survey Period	National April 1995 and April 1999
Sample	About 40,000 households in each survey period completing the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design	• To control for Food Stamp eligibility, analysis was restricted to low-income households (income below 130% of the poverty threshold) because these households are generally income eligible for Food Stamps. Within this group, analysis was further restricted to Food Stamp non-recipients because of the ambiguity inherent in interpreting changes in food security among recipients. • Food security prevalence estimates calculated from FSCM data from the Food Security Supplements. • Food security status used as a measure of perceived need for food assistance. • Prevalences of food insecurity and hunger were calculated for categories defined by income, Food Stamp receipt, and household composition, and these prevalences were compared between 1995 and 1999. • To assess the extent to which food insecurity was affected by changes in income, estimates from a logistic regression model of the association of food insecurity with income by subpopulation for 1995 were applied to 1999 data for the corresponding subpopulation. This provided an estimate of what the prevalence of food insecurity would have been in 1999 if nothing changed except income composition. • Separate analysis of non-citizens completed, since most non-citizens became ineligible for cash assistance and food stamps during the period of study.
Key Food Security Findings	• Food insecurity increased substantially (by 5 percentage points or 22%) among low-income non-food stamp recipient households. This suggests that the decline in food stamp participation resulted primarily from reduced access. The increase in food insecurity among low-income, non-food stamp households was widespread, affecting all household types. • A corresponding increase in hunger did not occur (9% of low-income non-Food-Stamp households experienced hunger in both 1995 and 1999), suggesting that households facing hunger without food assistance were still able to access the Food Stamp program. This was especially true for single-mothers with children, among whom the prevalence of hunger declined significantly at the national level. • Food insecurity and hunger increased among low-income women living alone, both nationally and in nonmetro areas, and particularly for those receiving Food Stamps. These increases did not appear to be associated with changes in Food Stamp participation, however. • Nationally, increasing incomes contributed substantially to the decline in Food Stamp use: the proportion of households with incomes below 130% of the poverty line declined from 24% in 1995 to 19% in 1999. Adjusted for population growth, this represents a decline of 21% in the low-income, generally food stamp eligible population. • However, among low-income households, Food Stamp use declined by 37%. Declines were largest for non-citizens (57%) and for 2-parent families with children (41%), and smallest for women living alone (24%). In absolute terms, the decline was largest for single mothers with children (21 percentage points).

DOES THE DECLINE IN FOOD STAMP USE BY RURAL LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS REPRESENT LESS NEED OR LESS ACCESS? EVIDENCE FROM NEW DATA ON FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER

September 2000

Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

	• At the national level, food insecurity declined by 1.7 percentage points from 1995 to 1999. This decline can be accounted for entirely by higher incomes in 1999. • Patterns in food stamp use and food security in rural areas did not differ greatly from national patterns.
Conclusions	• Substantially increased food insecurity among low-income households not receiving food stamps indicates that much of the decline in the proportion of low-income households receiving food stamps resulted from reduced access to food stamps. • Households with the most need (i.e., facing hunger) appear to have been able to access food assistance since hunger did not increase. • In general, there is little evidence of important differences in the causes and consequences of declining food stamp caseloads between nonmetro and metro areas.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.jcpr.org/wpfiles/nordrural.PDF **Contact:** Mark Nord, Economic Research Service, 1800 M Street NW, Room 2068, Washington, DC 20036-5831; Tel: 202-694-5433; E-mail: marknord@econ.ag.gov **Study author:** Mark Nord Paper presented at "Rural Dimensions of Welfare Reform: A Research Conference on Poverty, Welfare, and Food Assistance," sponsored by Northeastern University/University of Chicago Joint Center for Poverty Research, U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, and Rural Policy Institute, Washington, DC, May 4-5, 2000.

HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES, 1999

September 2000

Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To present the most recent available information on the changing level of food security among U.S. households during the period 1995 to 1999 as well as estimates of the extent of hunger and food insecurity in 1999.
Location and Survey Period	National April 1995, September 1996, April 1997, August 1998, and April 1999
Sample	About 40,000 households in each survey period completing the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design	• Food security prevalence estimates are calculated from FSCM data from the Food Security Supplements. • Data were adjusted to permit cross-year comparisons (the main adjustment was the application of common screening criteria to each year's data). This results in an understated food insecurity prevalence; the prevalence estimate for hunger is less affected by the screening change. Figures that compare 1999 findings with 1995 are based on adjusted data, while the food insecurity figures cited for 1999 without reference to any prior year use the unadjusted data.
Key Food Security Findings	• In 1999, 10.5 million households (10.1% of all U.S. households) were food insecure. 31 million people (about 12% of all Americans) lived in these households, and nearly 40% of food-insecure individuals were children (or about 12 million children under age 18). • Over 3 million households experienced hunger during the 12 months preceding the 1999 survey. Nearly 8 million people lived in these households, over one-third of whom were children. • Groups that continued to have a higher than average food insecurity prevalence in 1999 included female-headed households with children (30%), households with children under 6 (16%), Black non-Hispanic households (21%), Hispanic households (21%), and households with incomes below 185% of the poverty line (26%). • The number of food-insecure households fell by 12% from 1995 to 1999. The number of households where at least one member experienced hunger fell by 24%. Adjusted for population growth, the number of households experiencing food insecurity fell 16% and the number experiencing hunger fell 28%. • The prevalence of food insecurity and hunger declined for nearly all household types, including female-headed households with children, Hispanic households, households living in central cities, and households in the Midwest. • With respect to income groupings (relative to the poverty line), the pattern for food insecurity varied. Although households under 50% of the poverty line experienced slightly *lower* food insecurity (38% in 1995 compared to 37% in 1999), the prevalence of food insecurity for households with incomes between 50% and 130% of the poverty line *increased* somewhat, even though there were 715,000 fewer food insecure households in this category in 1999 than 1995. For higher-income households (with incomes at or above 185% of the poverty line), food insecurity was *unchanged* (3% in 1995 and 1999).
Conclusions	• The prevalence of food insecurity and hunger in the U.S. declined significantly over the latter half of the 1990s, presumably reflecting increased household income and employment resulting from the strong economy. • Households with incomes between 50 and 130% of the poverty line were the only household types among the 30 subgroups studied to show a higher rate of food insecurity in 1999 than in 1995.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/epubs/pdf/fanrr8/ (Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 8) **Authors:** Margaret Andrews, Mark Nord, Gary Bickel, and Steven Carlson

PREVALENCE OF HUNGER DECLINES IN RURAL HOUSEHOLDS

December 2000

Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Objective	To examine trends in hunger and food insecurity prevalence among rural households in the United States.
Location and Survey Period	National April 1995, September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998
Sample	About 40,000 households in each survey period completing the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a representative national sample of approximately 50,000 households conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Study Design	• Food security prevalence estimates calculated from FSCM data from the Food Security Supplements. • Unadjusted figures are used for single-year reporting. Figures were adjusted for cross-year comparisons (the main adjustment was the application of common screening criteria to each year's data). This adjustment may underestimate the true food insecurity prevalence, though the prevalence estimates for hunger are less affected. • A measure of child hunger was calculated by estimating the number of households with levels of food insecurity so severe that children were also hungry at times. Households classified as having hunger among children responded "yes" to at least 5 of the 8 items in the FSCM that ask specifically about children's experiences of food stress.
Key Food Security Findings	• In 1998, 88% of rural households were food secure. 12% of rural households (2.4 million households) were food insecure and 3.4% (0.7 million households) experienced hunger. Food insecurity was highest in the rural West and South (14%) and lowest in the rural Midwest (8%). • The prevalence of hunger in rural areas declined by 0.5% between 1995 and 1998, while the prevalence of food insecurity remained the same. • Food insecurity prevalence in 1998 was the same for rural and urban households (12%). Similar trends in urban and rural food insecurity and hunger were found across geographic regions, household types, income categories, and among racial/ethnic groups. • In 1998, food insecurity was most prevalent in single-parent households with children (35% rural, 33% urban) and among minorities. Rural blacks experienced nearly three times the food insecurity prevalence as rural Whites (28% for Blacks, 10% for Whites), and the food insecurity prevalence among rural Hispanics was almost twice that of rural Whites (21% for Hispanics, 10% for Whites). Higher food insecurity prevalence among racial and ethnic minorities reflects higher poverty rates among these groups. • Elderly in both urban and rural areas were less than half as likely as other adults to live in food insecure households (5.7% vs. 12.3%, respectively), though the FSCM may not adequately identify and measure food insecurity among the elderly. • In 1998, 1 out of 5 rural children lived in food insecure households and 4.5% lived in households that experienced hunger. An estimated 1% of rural households had levels of food insecurity so severe that children were also hungry at times. Child hunger was much more prevalent in single-parent families than in two-parent families.
Contact Information	**Study published as:** "Prevalence of Hunger Declines in Rural Households," *Rural Conditions and Trends.* December 2000. Vol. 11, No. 2: 80-86. Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/rcat/rcat112/RCAT112M.PDF **Study authors:** Mark Nord; Tel: 202-694-5443; E-mail: marknord@ers.usda.gov; F. Joshua Winicki; Tel: 202-694-5448; E-mail: jwinicki@ers.usda.gov Also see "New Indicator Reveals Similar Levels of Food Security in Rural and Urban Households," *Rural Conditions and Trends.* February 1999. Vol. 9, No. 2: 91-96. Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/RCAT/Rcat92/rcat92p.pdf

State and Local Food Security Study Summaries

REPRESENTATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD OF DETROIT: A PILOT STUDY OF FOOD SECURITY STATUS

March 1998

Hunger Action Coalition of Michigan

Objective	To assess the conditions of food security and hunger in a Detroit neighborhood, and determine the feasibility of implementing a food security and hunger study on a city-wide basis. Study was requested by Detroit City Planning Commission.
Location and Survey Period	Neighborhood in Detroit reflecting overall demographics of City of Detroit ("Planning Sector One" region). Interviews conducted during October 1996 and January 1997.
Sample	• 352 households. • 89% Black, 73% of household heads were female, 67% had household incomes below $20,000, almost half lived below poverty line, and 60% had children under age 18.
Study Design	• Created questionnaire based on FSCM plus questions on race, age of household head, household income and composition. • Door-to-door interviews primarily with the head of household. • Assistance with instrument design, training of interviewers, and data entry and analysis provided by Survey & Evaluation Services of Center for Urban Studies, Wayne State University.
Key Food Security Findings	• Almost 40% of households were food insecure in 12 months preceding survey. • 16% of households experienced hunger during this period. • Households with children were the most food insecure and experienced the highest prevalence of hunger, while the opposite was true for households with elderly persons.
Conclusions	• Project demonstrates the ability to successfully implement a local/neighborhood food security survey. • Results support hypotheses about the relationship between income constraints and food security status. • Recommend a subsequent assessment of food security in this neighborhood after full impact of recent welfare reform changes have taken effect. • The high levels of hunger and food insecurity in this neighborhood suggest need for a city-wide assessment.
Contact Information	Hunger Action Coalition of Michigan, 2727 2nd Avenue, Suite 109, Detroit, MI 48201; Tel: 313-965-8433 Center for Urban Studies, Wayne State University, 656 West Kirby, Room 3040, FAB, Detroit, MI 48202; Tel: 313-577-2208

LEGAL IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS IN TWO CALIFORNIA COUNTIES: THE IMPACT OF FOOD STAMP CUTS

May 1998

California Food Policy Advocates

Objective	To determine the prevalence of hunger among children in legal immigrant households where food stamps had been cut in Los Angeles and San Francisco counties.
Location and Survey Period	2 counties in California: in Los Angeles County, surveys were conducted in November 1997 (376 surveys) and in March 1998 (403 surveys); in San Francisco county, 241 interviews conducted in January 1998.
Sample	• Random sample drawn from food stamp households with at least 1 noncitizen member and which were scheduled to come in for recertification or verification interviews during 3 designated months. • In Los Angeles, sample consisted primarily of families with children, the majority of which were from Mexico and Central or South America. • In San Francisco, sample evenly divided between households with and without children. Majority of respondents were from East or Southeast Asia or from the former Soviet Union.
Study Design	• Case-control study: sample population divided into impacted cases (those with at least one member who had lost food stamps due to legal immigrant provision) and controls (those where no household member lost food stamps). • In-person interviews conducted by county eligibility workers with heads of households who voluntarily agreed to participate. • FSCM instrument used, plus follow-up questions focusing on period since September 1, 1997 (date of food stamp cut). • Surveys translated into 6 languages, and translation services made available.
Key Food Security Findings	*Los Angeles* • Children living in immigrant households where food stamps have been cut were suffering from worsening rates of severe hunger. • Impacted immigrant households were one-third more likely to experience food insecurity with severe hunger than similar immigrant households not impacted by the food stamp cuts. • Regardless of whether or not households experienced food stamp benefit cuts, legal immigrant households experienced high levels of food insecurity and hunger, all of which worsened between November and March. (By March 1998, half of the impacted group and 3% of the households that did not experience benefit cuts experienced household food insecurity with moderate or severe hunger.) *San Francisco* • Children living in immigrant households where food stamps have been cut were suffering from very high rates of hunger (33% experiencing moderate or severe hunger). • Immigrant households cut off food stamps were almost twice as likely to experience food insecurity with severe hunger (6.3% vs. 2.3%). • Adult food stamp households have fared very badly since the cuts.
Conclusions	• Children living in immigrant households where food stamps have been cut were suffering from very high rates of hunger. • High rates of hunger among these households were detected despite concerted public and private efforts to mitigate the potential (and expected) harm caused by the food stamp terminations. • Immigrant food stamp cuts contained in the federal welfare reform bill are generating hunger and harming both children and adults.

LEGAL IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS IN TWO CALIFORNIA COUNTIES: THE IMPACT OF FOOD STAMP CUTS

May 1998

California Food Policy Advocates

Contact Information	**Summary available at:** http://www.cfpa.net **Contact:** George Manalo-LeClair, Director of Food Stamp Advocacy, California Food Policy Advocates, 116 New Montgomery Street, Suite 530, San Francisco, CA 94105; Tel: 415-777-4422; E-mail: george@cfpa.net

AT-RISK HOUSEHOLDS IN GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN

May 1998

Brown County Food and Hunger Network and University of Wisconsin-Cooperative Extension

Objective	To estimate the prevalence of food insecurity among at-risk households using food assistance programs.
Location and Survey Period	Green Bay, Wisconsin April/May 1998
Sample	• 356 household interviews completed (72.2% response rate) at 21 sites (meal sites, schools, food pantries, WIC, elderly housing). • 57% White, 21% Asian, 9% Hispanic, 4% Black. A large proportion of Asian and Hispanic households were likely to be immigrants. 77% female; 55% between ages of 19-39; 15% aged 61 and over. 66% families with children.
Study Design	• The Food and Hunger Network initially contacted all sites with relevant programs detailing the purpose of the survey and inviting them to participate. 15 programs (meal sites, schools, food pantries, WIC, and 6 subsidized apartment blocks for low-income elderly) agreed to participate. • FSCM used plus additional questions concerning demographic characteristics of family education, means of travel to site, and stability of residence. Income level not asked out of sensitivity to respondents; proportion of people owning own home and levels of education pointed to low-income status. • Interviews conducted by college seniors from University of WI-Green Bay (24 students).
Key Food Security Findings	• 66% of respondents reported food insecurity with varying degrees of hunger. Of these, well over half (58%) suffered moderate to severe hunger. • Other findings included the following: households using meal sites and food pantries were the most severely under-nourished; food insecurity varied inversely with the level of education; non-white ethnic groups experienced higher proportions of food insecurity than did whites at every level of severity except for the Asian grouping; those with health concerns were 1.3 times more likely to be food insecure than those who were healthy.
Conclusions	• Prevalence rates calculated from study will become very valuable when the study is repeated in a year's time. • The fact that 38% of the users of the food assistance programs were suffering from food insecurity with moderate or severe hunger is alarming. This means that 1,662 adults and 897 children went without eating for an entire day because they did not have enough money. • Some of the food insecurity among immigrant populations in Green Bay may be attributed to food stamp cuts. It is possible that up to 32% of the at-risk population surveyed in Green Bay (i.e., Asian and Hispanic groups) were immigrants.
Contact Information	**Contact:** Anne Kok, Professor of Social Work, University of WI-Green Bay, 2420 Nicolet Dr, Suite CL710, Green Bay, WI 54311-7001; Tel: 920-465-2567; E-mail: koka@uwgb.edu Karen Early, Brown County University of Wisconsin-Extension Office, 1150 Bellevue Street, Green Bay, WI 54302-2259; Tel: 920-391-4614; E-mail: karen.early@ces.uwex.edu

PERSONS RECEIVING EMERGENCY FOOD IN TWELVE CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

June 1998

California Food Policy Advocates

Objective	To obtain information about how welfare policy changes are affecting the general low-income population in California, particularly those who may no longer be participating in formal cash or food assistance programs.
Location and Survey Period	Sites in 12 counties, urban and rural, in central and southern California. April – May 1998
Sample	• 823 households based on a pooled random sample of 1,015 clients at 26 emergency food and charitable social service agencies. • 97% living at or below poverty line and 52% living in extreme poverty (less than 30% of the poverty threshold). • Majority of respondents U.S. citizens (67%) or immigrants from Mexico (25%), of the 71% of the sample who answered questions concerning country of origin.
Study Design	• FSCM administered by charitable social service agencies to their client populations using emergency food and other services. • Additional demographic data collected plus information on food stamp use. • Agency employees or volunteers administered survey questionnaire in face-to-face interviews.
Key Food Security Findings	• 27% of households experienced food insecurity with severe (child) hunger, and 33% were food insecure with moderate hunger present--an overall hunger prevalence of 60%. • Households reporting food stamp cuts in the past year experienced significantly higher hunger rates than households reporting no food stamp cuts. • Immigrant families with food stamp cuts had the highest rates of hunger in the sample (75%). • Single adults seeking emergency food also were faring badly, with 59% experiencing moderate to severe hunger.
Conclusions	• Study found extremely high rates of food insecurity and hunger among the groups of California's population that were surveyed. • Children in sample households often were not protected from the negative consequences of hunger and malnutrition even though they were eligible for federal or state nutrition programs. • Study supports the claim that the food stamp cuts in the federal welfare reform bill are generating hunger and harming both children and adults. • Full restoration of food stamps to all impacted immigrant households is needed to protect vulnerable populations from hunger. • Legislative and county governments must address the implications of current federal and state policies that enforce time limits and harsh sanctions on single jobless adults who rely on food stamps during periods of seasonal unemployment.
Contact Information	**Summary available at:** http://www.cfpa.net **Contact:** George Manalo-LeClair, Director of Food Stamp Advocacy, California Food Policy Advocates, 116 New Montgomery Street, Suite 530, San Francisco, CA 94105; Tel: 415-777-4422; E-mail: george@cfpa.net Study done in collaboration with California Catholic Charities, Sacramento City & County Hunger Commission, St. Anthony Foundation, Camarillo Community Church, and Catholic Social Services.

HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER AMONG FAMILIES USING FOOD BANKS

March/April 1999

University of Toronto

Objective	To investigate the food insecurity and nutritional vulnerability of women in families using food banks.
Location and Survey Period	Metropolitan Toronto, Canada. Interviews conducted during period May 1996 to April 1997.
Sample	• 153 women in families receiving emergency food assistance. • All women; 20% recent immigrants; 65% single parents; average household income was 53% of poverty line; 40% reported a long-standing health condition, illness, or disability.
Study Design	• Participants recruited on a first-come, first-serve basis from a stratified random sample of emergency food programs in metro area, with agency recruitment quotas set in proportion to number of people served in each stratum. • 3 in-person interviews conducted during 3-week period following recruitment into the sample; interview location chosen by respondent. • Used 30-day and 12-month FSCM plus 24-hour dietary intake recall; questions included on household demographics, perceived health, health-related behaviors, and food acquisition and provisioning practices.
Key Food Security Findings	• 94% of study participants reported food insecurity during the 12 months prior to the interview, with 70% reporting food insecurity with some degree of hunger. • Household food insecurity with some hunger over past 30 days was reported by 57% of study participants. • Families obtained assistance from food banks an average of 13 times during 12 months before survey. The frequency of food bank use was not significantly correlated with household food security status; however, the number of times a family sought food assistance was positively associated with reported concerns about food sufficiency among children. • 28% of women reported that they began using food banks in the previous 12 months. The median time since first using a food bank was 2.2 years. The longer the time period since first seeking food assistance, the more severe was the household food insecurity reported over prior 12 months. • Use of food banks was only one of the strategies women relied on to augment scarce resources to obtain food. • Women reporting hunger in their households during prior 30 days had systematically lower energy and nutrient intakes than those not reporting hunger. These women also appeared at risk of deficiency for several nutrients. • Estimated prevalence of inadequacy in excess of 15% was noted for Vitamin A, folate, iron, and magnesium, suggesting that the low levels of intake associated with severe household food insecurity are in a range that could put women at risk of nutrient deficiencies.
Conclusions	• Food bank use is a marker of household food insecurity, which may signify nutritional risk. • Food supplies in the households studied were chronically compromised. • Women's dietary intakes are compromised in the context of reported household food insecurity and their subjective appraisals of household food security are reflected in the adequacy of their own dietary intakes. • Study findings point to potential nutritional problems associated with lower energy and nutrient intakes, the long-term impact of which is of concern insofar as the nutrients are implicated in chronic diseases (e.g., calcium and osteoporosis). • While food bank use may alleviate some degree of food deprivation, it does not prevent household members from going hungry.

	• Food banks cannot be expected to resolve the food scarcity and deprivation found in this study. More effective responses, ideally addressing the severe and chronic poverty which underlies household food security, are urgently needed.
Contact Information	**Study published as:** "Household Food Insecurity and Hunger Among Families Using Food Banks," *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, March – April 1999, Vol. 90, No. 2: 109-113. Also see previously published article: "Women's Dietary Intakes in the Context of Household Food Insecurity." *Journal of Nutrition*, March 1999, Vol. 129, No. 3: 672-679. **Contact:** Dr. Valerie S. Tarasuk, Department of Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3E2, CANADA; Tel: 416-978-0618; E-mail: valerie.tarasuk@utoronto.ca **Study authors:** Valerie S. Tarasuk and George H. Beaton

HUNGER IN KANSAS
August 1999
Kansas Health Institute

Objective	To determine the prevalence of hunger in Kansas, and to identify particular subgroups at increased risk of experiencing hunger.
Location and Survey Period	Kansas April 1995
Sample	571 Kansas households from the April 1995 Current Population Survey containing the Food Security Supplement.
Study Design	• Data for Kansas from the April 1995 CPS were analyzed in addition to demographic, geographic, household, labor force, and weighting variables. • Persons were assigned a food security score based on the food security status of their household during the previous 12-month period. • Estimates were weighted to be representative of the entire Kansas population. Sample sizes for subpopulations are not reported (e.g., African Americans, single female-headed households).
Key Food Security Findings	• Over 300,000 people in Kansas (13%) are estimated to report a "lack of a secure supply of food," (i.e., were food insecure) at some point during the previous year. Of these, 91,000 (4%) are estimated to live in households that experienced hunger. • More than one-third (35,000) of those who lived in households that experienced hunger were children, equivalent to nearly 1 in 20 children in Kansas. • Over one-quarter of individuals in households with incomes below 185% of the poverty level reported household food insecurity, compared to only 3% of those above the poverty level. • African-Americans were 3 times more likely than Whites to experience household food insecurity during the previous year (33% vs. 10%). • 1 out of every 4 children (27%) living in single female-headed households experienced hunger, nearly twice the national average of similar children (14%).
Conclusions	• Hunger is present in Kansas. • Minorities and the poor are at increased risk of food insecurity. • Specific groups of children are at particular risk of food insecurity.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.khi.org **Contact:** Billie Hall, Director of Public Affairs, Kansas Health Institute, 100 SE Ninth Street Third Floor, Topeka, KS 66612-1212; Tel: 785-233-5443; E-mail: bhall@khi.org **Study authors:** Robert F. St. Peter and David Bourdon

FOOD SECURITY SURVEY OF AT-RISK HOUSEHOLDS IN GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN – SPRING 1999

September 1999

University of Wisconsin-Cooperative Extension and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

Objective	To determine the food insecurity prevalence of at-risk households in Green Bay and compare it to the 1998 prevalence; to better understand the reasons for food insecurity; and to determine the types of initiatives that would increase the availability and accessibility of food to food-insecure households.
Location and Survey Period	Green Bay, Wisconsin Four-week period, Spring 1999
Sample	• 566 respondents from 11 program sites (meal sites, food pantries, and WIC offices). Final data set consisted of 541 respondents and 10 sites. • 83% of respondents female; 81% were younger than 40; almost two-thirds (63%) were Caucasian; 75% had been employed some time during the last year; 48% resided in households containing 4 or more people; and 78% lived in households with children.
Study Design	• 25 undergraduates in the University of WI Social Work Professional Program conducted interviews at designated sites serving low-income individuals. Program participants at sites during the survey period were asked to participate. • Hmong, Spanish, and Russian interpreters were available for non-English speaking respondents.
Key Food Security Findings	• Food security status in 1999 was very similar to 1998: in both years, 56% of respondents were food insecure. About one-third were food insecure without hunger, and approximately 20% were food insecure with hunger. • Although Hispanic respondents were significantly less food secure in 1999 compared to 1998 (33% vs. 57%), Hmong respondents were somewhat more food secure in 1999. • A greater percentage of Native Americans, African-American and Hispanic respondents experienced food insecurity with hunger in 1999 compared to 1998. • 14% of WIC respondents reported food insecurity with hunger, compared to 50% of food pantry and 46% of meal site respondents. • One-third of respondents who reported going to food pantries during the last year said it was the first time they received food assistance from a food pantry. These respondents were more likely to be employed and to earn the median wage or less compared to those who first visited a pantry more than a year ago. • Respondents' food security status was related to the number of types of sites at which they received assistance. Respondents who visited 2 types of sites were more than twice as likely to be food insecure with hunger compared to those who visited 1 type of site (44% vs. 18%). • Insufficient money to buy food was the most common reason cited for food insecurity. One-third of respondents reported food insecurity due to lack of access to a car, inability to access food pantries during open hours, or childcare problems; one-third also reported insufficient time to prepare food. • When asked what initiatives would help them get the food they need, 32% of the overall sample (48% of those food insecure with hunger) identified a traveling grocery store, 28% (46% of those food insecure with hunger) identified improved transportation, and 24% identified community gardens and a grocery store downtown.
Conclusions	• Although overall food security prevalence remained the same from 1998 to 1999, the food security status of specific groups changed. • Although virtually all respondents reported being unable to acquire food due to insufficient financial resources, a substantial percentage also gave reasons associated with economic issues such as not having a car or childcare problems. • The type of site at which interviews took place and the number of different sites respondents visited were strongly associated with food security status.

FOOD SECURITY SURVEY OF AT-RISK HOUSEHOLDS IN GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN – SPRING 1999
September 1999
University of Wisconsin-Cooperative Extension

	• Access to food appears to be a serious problem for this population and the proposed food assistance initiatives would be beneficial, especially for those who are most food insecure.
Contact Information	**Contact:** Anne Kok, University of Wisconsin-Cooperative Extension, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Social Work Professional Program, Suite CL710, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311-7001; Tel: 920-465-2567; E-mail: koka@uwgb.edu **Study authors:** Theresa M. Dethlefs, Anne Kok, and Karen Early Study consists of 3 reports: Summary of Findings, Characteristics of Households At-Risk for Food Insecurity in Green Bay, and Food Security Survey of At-Risk Households in Green Bay.

47

FROM WELFARE RELIANCE TO WAGE WORK: A REPORT ON FOOD SECURITY AMONG LOUISIANA'S RURAL WELFARE POPULATION

October 1999

School of Human Ecology, Louisiana State University

Objective	To advance the understanding of welfare reform and food assistance issues in the rural South through interviews with former and soon-to-be former welfare reliant women in Louisiana.
Location and Survey Period	Rural Louisiana Phase One: Fall 1997 – May 1998; Phase Two: Fall 1998 – Spring 1999.
Sample	• 84 women completed the 1st interview round and 52 were re-interviewed 1 year later. • The women were initially located at 7 parishes where they were taking GED or training classes. • All of the women interviewed were receiving welfare payments in 1997-1998, but faced eligibility termination in 12-24 months. • In Phase One and Two, over 80% of respondents were African-American, over 90% were single, and by the second round, 41 of the 52 women interviewed were no longer participating in Louisiana's welfare program.
Study Design	• Longitudinal, qualitative study of rural women's transition from welfare reliance to wage work. • Qualitative interview approach combined with administration of the FSCM "short form."
Key Food Security Findings	• 21% of respondents (n=11) were classified as food insecure; 13% (n=7) were classified as food insecure with hunger. • Women classified as food insecure were not significantly different from food secure women in the sample. However, women who experienced food insecurity with hunger had little or no work history compared to the larger sample. • 87% of respondents still received food stamps. Of the 7 respondents who no longer received food stamp benefits, only 1 was classified as food insecure. 86% of the women said that their children eat breakfast and lunch at school at reduced or no cost. • Very few respondents classified as food insecure used food pantries or surplus commodity distribution programs for food, apparently because few of the rural areas in which these women lived offered such resources.
Conclusions	• Most respondents did not experience food insecurity after transitioning from welfare to the labor force, which may be due in part to high participation in the Food Stamp Program. • For the women who did report food insecurity, their response was to skip or cut the size of meals, serve meals they did not consider nutritionally balanced, and let their children eat first, taking what was left for adults in the family.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://ext.msstate.edu/srdc/activities/monroedraft.htm **Contact:** Pamela A. Monroe, PhD, School of Human Ecology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803; Tel: 225-388-1731; E-mail: pmonroe@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu **Study authors:** Pamela A. Monroe, Vicky R. Tiller, and Lydia B. Blalock Report prepared for and presented to the Economic Research Service, USDA, October 1999.

THE RHODE ISLAND FOOD SECURITY MONITORING PROJECT: ASSESSING THE PREVALENCE OF HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN RHODE ISLAND

November 1999

Rhode Island Department of Health

Objective	To introduce the concept of "food security" to Rhode Islanders; to describe sociodemographic characteristics of food insecure households; and to provide, for the first time, an estimate of hunger and food insecurity prevalence among households residing in poverty areas of Rhode Island.
Location and Survey Period	Poverty areas within Rhode Island March – April 1999
Sample	• A randomized list of telephone numbers was generated for 41 poverty census tracts. 410 households completed a telephone interview. • Respondents were predominantly White (76.4%); 229 respondents (55.9%) lived in 1 or 2 member households; 38.1% of households had children; more than two-thirds of respondents had total household incomes less than $26,000; and more than 60% of respondents were not employed at the time of the survey.
Study Design	• Sample based upon a random digit dial telephone list generated from households within any of the 41 poverty census tracts (households with no telephone service or an unlisted telephone number were not included in the survey). • Interviewers administered the FSCM in English or Spanish, along with additional sociodemographic questions.
Key Food Security Findings	• 100 households (24.4%) were food insecure. • Of the 100 food insecure households, 36 (or 8.8% of the total sample) were food insecure with moderate or severe hunger. • Food insecurity was significantly associated with: less than a 12th grade education; Hispanic ethnicity; children in the household, especially under 6 years of age; household size of 5 or more; single-parent households; a household head who was out of work or unable to work; and household income below $26,000.
Conclusions	• The prevalence of food insecurity among those living in poverty areas in Rhode Island was almost 3 times that of the general Rhode Island population (24.4% vs. 8.7%), as estimated by the USDA for the period 1996-98. • Prevalence estimates of food insecurity in this report may underestimate the real prevalence of food insecurity in the target areas surveyed, as the survey did not capture homeless individuals, those in temporary housing/shelters, and households without phones or listed phone numbers. • Almost 1 in 4 individuals in the sample were food insecure, raising strong concerns about the well-being of this segment of the population.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.health.state.ri.us/family/rifsmp/hunger99.htm **Project Directors:** Bethany Di Napoli (E-mail: bethanyd@doh.state.ri.us), Samara Viner-Brown (E-mail: samv@doh.state.ri.us), Rhode Island Department of Health, Division of Family Health, Room 302, Cannon Building, Providence, RI 02908-5097; Tel: 401-222-2312.

FACE VALIDITY OF THE CORE FOOD SECURITY MODULE WITH ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS

January/February 2000

Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University

Objective	To assess the face validity of the 18-item FSCM among low-income Asian and Pacific Islanders in Hawaii and to examine predictors of food security status.
Location and Survey Period	Oahu, Hawaii Fall 1998
Sample	• 61 adult respondents with children recruited from emergency food pantries or Head Start preschools. Neighborhoods with high poverty rates and participation in free school lunches were targeted. • Respondents were primarily female (95%); 46% from households with 6 or more members; and 31% had household incomes at or below $10,000. 38% classified themselves as Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, 21% Caucasian, 23% Filipino, and 18% Samoan.
Study Design	• 9 focus groups were conducted (2 for each ethnic group and 3 for Samoans). • Information collected on demographics and household income. 4 open-ended questions about hunger posed in focus groups. FSCM administered and cognitive testing of participants' understanding of 18-items conducted.
Key Food Security Findings	• 74% of focus group participants classified as food insecure, with 34% reporting household food insecurity with hunger. • 34% of respondents participated in the Food Stamp Program, 41% in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, 34% in the free or reduced School Lunch Program, and 23% in Head Start. 67% reported using food pantry services. • Focus group responses generally conveyed that FSCM questions and possible responses were meaningful to food-insecure individuals and consistent with their understanding of the experience of running out of food. • No major differences between the 4 ethnic groups were observed with respect to face validity. • Cognitive testing did not support the use of Q11—loss of weight due to lack of money for food. Lack of weight loss may be related to intake of high-fat foods in HI such as canned meats and dried noodles (Saimin). • In terms of predictive variables, food security status appeared related to vegetable intake and various indices of financial status.
Conclusions	• For the 4 ethnic groups evaluated, qualitative findings generally confirmed the face validity of the FSCM questions and the operationalized framework of food insecurity. However, additional testing is needed to confirm these findings. • The overall food insecurity prevalence among respondents was much higher than that reported by the USDA for the state of Hawaii (74% vs. 10.4%).
Contact Information	**Study published as**: "Face Validity of the Core Food Security Module with Asians and Pacific Islanders." *Journal of Nutrition Education*. January/February 2000, Vol. 32, No. 1: 21-30. **Contact**: Joda Derrickson, Executive Director, Full Plate, Inc., 44-155-4 Laha St., Kaneohe, HI 96744; Tel: 808-234-6317; E-mail: laniwai4@pixi.com **Study authors**: Joda Derrickson and Jennifer Anderson

CONCURRENT VALIDITY OF THE FACE VALID FOOD SECURITY MEASURE

March 2000

Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University

Objective	To determine whether the "face valid" FSCM categorical measure is a valid and reliable categorical measure to use with Asians and Pacific Islanders in HI.
Location and Survey Period	Hawaii June – November 1998
Samples	• Convenience sample of 144 food pantry recipients. • A statewide sample of 1469 respondents from the 1998 HI Health Survey.
Study Design	• Qualitative findings and previous FSCM scale validation efforts suggest an alternative food security categorical measure that is truer to the "grounded experience" of low-income HI residents. This measure uses the 18-item FSCM but applies different scoring rules: any affirmative response is initially classified as "at risk of hunger" (i.e., food insecure without hunger), classification as "adult hungry" requires affirmative response to either Q10 "respondent hungry" or Q12 "any adult did not eat for a whole day"; "child hungry" requires affirmative response to Q14 "any child hungry." • The alternative measure results in a more liberal food insecurity classification but a stricter hunger classification; it separates hunger categories for adults and children; and classification is based on responses to specific indicators rather than categorization based on the sum of responses. • A respondent's food security sum was created from the total number of affirmative responses. Based on this sum and whether or not a household had children, the algorithm for the alternative measure was applied.
Key Food Security Findings	• 88% of the sample from the HI Health Survey were found to be food secure; only 12.5% of the food pantry sample were food secure. Among the food pantry households, 22% and 14.5% reported adult and child hunger, respectively, compared to 2% and 0.1% among the general population sample. • The hungry were more likely than the food secure to be beneficiaries of all assistance programs except Social Security income, unemployment benefits, and WIC. Of households experiencing hunger among children, 46% were on welfare, 58% received food stamps, and 65% were beneficiaries of free or reduced-price school meals. Only WIC participation showed a negative correlation with deteriorating food security status. • Whereas low income was a factor contributing to food insecurity in many households, recent loss of a job and amount of household savings were more important determinants. • Food insecurity and hunger were more likely among households with children than those without children, and single-parent families were the most food-insecure type of household. • There was a remarkable discrepancy in food security status between ethnic groups in HI: food insecurity was highest among Samoans, Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, and lowest among Japanese, other Asians, and Caucasians. • Deteriorating food security status was inversely related to average vegetable intake and increased reliance on Saimin (fried noodle product). • The hungrier households were, the more coping behaviors they used and the more often they used them. Use of a food pantry may be more "socially acceptable" or more common among the very needy than use of food stamps.
Conclusions	Evidence supports the concurrent validity of the alternative face valid measure at least among Asians and Pacific Islanders in HI.

CONCURRENT VALIDITY OF THE FACE VALID FOOD SECURITY MEASURE

March 2000

Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI and Colorado State University

Contact Information	**Available at:** http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/pubs/dp120600.pdf **Study published as:** JP Derrickson, JEL Anderson, AG Fisher. "Concurrent Validity of the Face Valid Food Security Measure," Discussion Paper no. 1206-00, March 2000, Institute for Research on Poverty. See also: JP Derrickson "Three Years of Food Security Measurement Research in Hawaii," Discussion Paper no. 1226-01, Institute for Research on Poverty, Available at: www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/pubs/dp122601.pdf **Contact**: Joda Derrickson, Executive Director, Full Plate, Inc., 44-155-4 Laha Street, Kaneohe, HI 96744; Tel: 808-234-6317; E-mail: laniwai4@pixi.com

FOOD SECURITY AND HUNGER IN POOR, MOTHER-HEADED FAMILIES IN FOUR U.S. CITIES

May 2000

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Objective	To examine food insecurity and hunger in poor mother-headed households that live in highly disadvantaged neighborhoods in 4 urban areas and that had received or currently receive welfare benefits.
Location and Survey Period	Cuyahoga, OH (Cleveland); Los Angeles, CA; Miami-Dade, FL; and Philadelphia, PA. March 1998 – March 1999
Sample	• Data on 3,765 single mothers aged 18-45 who received cash welfare benefits at some point in their lives drawn from the first round of MDRC's Project on Devolution & Urban Change (a 5-year multicomponent study of the effects of PRWORA on poor families with children). Project also includes an ethnographic study (information from 67 interviews included in this report) that provides rich, narrative data on how families are coping. • 68% of survey respondents were African-American; 25% Hispanic; 47% had a child under age 6 in the household; 46% did not have a high school diploma or GED. • One-third of survey sample was working without receiving cash welfare benefits; over half of respondents were welfare recipients (with one-third of these working); 11% were neither working nor receiving welfare. All ethnographic respondents were receiving welfare.
Study Design	• Data collected using an in-person survey as well as 67 in-depth ethnographic interviews with women from Cleveland and Philadelphia. • Survey interview topics included employment, income, living conditions, health and health care coverage, material hardship, and hunger. FSCM administered to survey respondents but not ethnographic respondents, who instead were asked questions about food expenditures, food deprivation, and use of emergency food services. • Four groups of women with different income sources at the time of the interview were compared: those working for pay and no longer receiving cash welfare benefits; those combining work with welfare; those receiving benefits without working; and those neither working nor receiving cash benefits. • A separate measure of child hunger was calculated using the 8 FSCM items that concern children's food intake, and diet quality and variety. The 3 resulting status categories are: child hunger, reduced-quality diet for children, and no child hunger or reduced-quality diet.
Key Food Security Findings	• Overall, about half of the families were food insecure, and hunger was found in slightly more than 15% of households. • In nearly one-third of surveyed families, children had reduced-quality diets or hunger, compared with 9% of households with children nationally. 26% of surveyed children had reduced-quality diets, while 5% experienced hunger. • Food insecurity was most prevalent among families where the mother had neither employment income nor welfare benefits. Food insecurity was lowest among the families where mothers were working and no longer getting welfare, but even in this group 45% were food insecure and nearly 15% experienced hunger. • With respect to welfare history, food security was highest among women who had left welfare more than one year earlier whereas recent leavers were the least likely to be food secure and the most likely to experience severe hunger, suggesting that income source transitions may have implications for food adequacy.

	• Families who received food stamps were less food secure than families not receiving food stamps (49% vs. 56%). Women who used an emergency food service such as a food pantry in the prior month were more than twice as likely to have experienced hunger than women who did not use these services (10% vs. 4%). • Food hardships varied significantly in the 4 city sites, with families in L.A. and Miami more likely to be food insecure than those in Cleveland or Philadelphia (66% and 64% vs. 45% and 41%, respectively). These geographic site differences are consistent with state differences cited in other national surveys. • Ethnographic interviews suggest that the term "food security" among poor families may sometimes be misleading. Most of the mothers classified as food secure nevertheless expended considerable energy to piece together numerous strategies to ensure adequate food. Current or recent food bank usage was mentioned by just over half of these respondents.
Conclusions	• The prevalence of food insecurity among urban households that have relied on welfare was substantially higher than the national prevalence and even the national prevalence for households with incomes below 50% of poverty. • Differences in food security levels among the 4 work and welfare groups were not substantial. These results are broadly consistent with evidence that working poor women experience as much material hardship as welfare-reliant women and that employment as a supplement to welfare does not necessarily ameliorate food hardships. • Food stamps by themselves do not guarantee food security. Other reforms for targeting nutrition assistance to low-income workers and their children may be needed to ensure that their basic food needs are met. • While the FSCM may be a reliable and valid indicator of hunger for the US population as a whole, it may not adequately describe the food problems faced by poor individuals. In particular, the FSCM may misclassify some poor women as food secure when, in fact, their array of coping strategies evinces a daunting struggle that most people who are truly food secure never face.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.mdrc.org/Reports2000/UrbanChange/FoodSecurityHunger.htm **Contact:** Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 16 East 34 Street, 19th Floor New York, NY 10016-4326; Tel: 212-532-3200. **Study authors:** Denise Polit, Andrew S. London, and John Martinez

CALAVERAS COUNTY HUNGER REPORT 2000: VOICES OF THE PEOPLE

August 2000

Human Resources Council, Inc. and University of California Cooperative Extension – Calaveras County

Objective	To gain a better understanding of hunger among Calaveras County residents.
Location and Survey Period	Calaveras County, California May - October 1999
Sample	159 household residents who sought assistance from emergency food programs and special service organizations that serve people below 185% of poverty level (e.g., WIC). Sample was primarily White (95%), female (93%), households with 2 or more adults (70%) and children (81%). Average monthly cash income was $1,354.
Study Design	• Self-administered questionnaire included FSCM as well as questions adapted from a 1987 University of California Hunger Survey. • Survey sites identified covered 5 main geographic areas of the county.
Key Food Security Findings	• Of the 159 respondents, 40% were food secure; 28% were food insecure without hunger; and 32% were food insecure with hunger. • 45% of households with children were food insecure. • Of households containing 1 or more disabled persons (n=29), 80% were food insecure. Over three-quarters of households with 1 or more members in poor health experienced food insecurity. 70% of households that put off medical and/or dental care because of inadequate money (n=71) were food insecure. • Of the households that participated in the Food Stamp Program (n=55), only one-third were food secure. • 37% of respondents received emergency food assistance and 52% of those reported needing help more than twice during the prior year. • Calaveras County Emergency Food Bank reported a 34% increase in the number of families seeking emergency food assistance from the 1st quarter of 1999 to the 1st quarter of 2000 (from 377 to 574).
Conclusions	• Hunger is a problem in all Calaveras County communities. • Recommendations for a Community Action Plan include: strengthen and support current emergency food system, identify and address needs of those who seek emergency food assistance, increase community awareness about hunger and food insecurity, advocate at all levels for policies that will help families achieve stability, and promote nutrition programs and services that provide a safety net for vulnerable families.
Contact Information	**Contact:** Billie Westernoff; Tel: 209-754-1257; E-mail: cesp@goldrush.com **Study authors:** Billie Westernoff, Program Director, Human Resources Council, Inc. and Anna Martin, Program Manager, University of California Cooperative Extension – Calaveras County

HUNGER IN LEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN CALIFORNIA, TEXAS, AND ILLINOIS

October 2000

Boston Medical Center, Natividad Medical Center (Salinas, CA), Louis A. Weiss Memorial Hospital (Chicago, IL)

Objective	To determine the prevalence of food insecurity and hunger and sociodemographic characteristics associated with hunger in a sample of low-income legal immigrants in the US.
Location and Survey Period	Salinas and Los Angeles, CA; Chicago, IL; and Houston, TX. (These 3 states contain a high percentage of total legal immigrants in the U.S.) March 1998
Sample	630 Mexican, Vietnamese, and Cambodian self-identified legal immigrants attending primary care clinics or community multiservice centers, or living in immigrant communities; 47% Asian and 53% Latino; 73% with incomes below 100% of the federal poverty line.
Study Design	• Questionnaire consisted of FSCM plus questions about health of household members, use of public benefits, income, employment, and demographics. • Household members interviewed in hospitals, clinics, and community centers. • Interviews conducted in Spanish and Vietnamese using translated versions of the questionnaire.
Key Food Security Findings	• 81% of households were food insecure. Over half (41%) experienced food insecurity with hunger; 14% experienced severe hunger. • 16% of households reported that their children were hungry, and 25% reported that they cut the size of their children's meals. • Households were more likely to be hungry if their income was below the poverty level, if they had poor English speaking ability, or if children lived in the household. • Of the families with children, 40% were not participating in any public assistance programs, and 67% received 2 or fewer benefits.
Conclusions	• The prevalence of hunger among low-income legal immigrants is unacceptably high at more than double the rate found recently in the general population of low-income families. • The high prevalence of hunger found in the sample population suggests that all low-income legal immigrants could benefit from the receipt of food stamps.
Contact Information	**Study published as**: "Hunger in Legal Immigrants in California, Texas, and Illinois." *American Journal of Public Health*, October 2000, Vol. 90, No. 10: 1629 – 1633. Also see "Hungry at Home: A Study of Food Insecurity and Hunger among Legal Immigrants in the United States," A Report by Physicians for Human Rights, August 2000. Available at: http://www.phrusa.org. **Contact:** Jennifer Kasper, Boston Medical Center, Dept. of Pediatrics, Division of General Academic Pediatrics, 91 East Concord Street, Maternity Building, Room 421, Boston, MA 02118, E-mail: jennifer.kasper@bmc.org **Study authors:** Jennifer Kasper, Sundeep K. Gupta, Phuong Tran, John T. Cook, and Alan F. Meyers

LEAVING WELFARE BEHIND: THE OKLAHOMA TANF LEAVERS REPORT

October 2000

Oklahoma Department of Human Services

Objective	To compare the well-being of welfare leavers, stayers, and low-income households in the general population in Oklahoma.
Location and Survey Period	Oklahoma February – May 2000
Sample	1,455 (369 TANF stayers; 483 TANF leavers; and 603 general population households with children present, of which 222 had total incomes below 200% of federal poverty level and were used as a low-income comparison group).
Study Design	• Welfare "leavers" were defined as those who had TANF cases that were open, closed, or denied between October 1, 1998 and September 30, 1999, but did not receive TANF benefits at the time of the interview. • TANF leavers were compared to current TANF recipients and households from the general population sample with earnings below 200% of poverty. • Comparisons were made across the 3 groups with respect to indicators of self-sufficiency, labor market success, and family well-being. The FSCM "short form" was administered.
Key Food Security Findings	• 17.5% of the general population respondents were food insecure. Nearly half of all leavers were food insecure, compared to 40% of stayers and 28% of respondents with incomes below 200% of poverty. • Food insecurity with hunger was found in nearly 30% of leaver households, 20% of stayers, and roughly 12% of general low-income respondents. • TANF leavers were by far the most food insecure and hungry of the groups investigated. Moreover, their food deprivation did not vary significantly by employment status. • Among respondents employed full time, 29% of leavers experienced food insecurity with hunger. This proportion was significantly higher than that of stayers (18%) and low-income general population respondents (9%). • Among respondents employed full time, leavers reported significantly lower earnings and total household income relative to both stayers and low-income households in the general population, while the latter two groups showed no statistically significant differences. More than 40% of leavers had no health insurance.
Conclusions	• Food insecurity is a significant problem in Oklahoma with a prevalence rate of 17.5% among general low-income population respondents. • Leavers are the most food insecure and economically insecure respondent group regardless of employment status. • Transitions to employment for TANF clients often result in significant economic hardships rather than "self-sufficiency."
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.okdhs.org/ifinance/Research_Studies/TANF%20LEAVERS%20STUDY3_files/TANF_LEAVERS_STUDY.htm **Contact:** Oklahoma Department of Human Services; Tel: 405-521-2908; E-mail: Marilynn.Knott@okdhs.org **Study authors:** Kenneth Kickham, Angela Harnden, Kim Sasser, Nury Effendi, and Robert Bentley

PROFILES OF POVERTY AND HUNGER IN OREGON 2000

October 2000

Oregon Food Bank

Objective	To identify the types of people seeking emergency food assistance and their reasons for seeking assistance.
Location and Survey Period	Oregon and Clark County, Washington April 4-24, 2000
Sample	3,299 households receiving emergency food boxes from 86 food pantries.
Study Design	• 5-page, self-administered questionnaire distributed to a representative from each household requesting a food box during the survey period. "Short form" of FSCM included. • Questions assessed participants' food security, income, employment, participation in federal programs, education, child care access, housing, health, and other relevant factors.
Key Food Security Findings	• 86% of households were food insecure and 54% were food insecure with hunger. • Additional questions revealed that 24% of households skipped or cut children's meals and 74% of households worried at least sometimes where their next meal was coming from. • 43% of households had at least one member working, yet 80% had incomes below the federal poverty line. • Since 1994-1995, average monthly enrollment in the Food Stamp Program in Oregon has fallen by 20% or 59,000 people. Over the same period, the number of people receiving an emergency food box through the Oregon Food Bank (OFB) Network rose by 31% or 121,576 people. • About 1 in 7 people in the state received food assistance through the OFB Network. • Recipient households visited food pantries 5.2 times during the past year compared to 4.6 times in 1998 and 3.8 times in 1996. 63% of respondents said they needed more than one food box per month (up from 57% in 1998). (A typical food box contains a 3-5 day supply of groceries.)
Conclusions	• The greatest need for food is among children and families. • More working poor are going hungry. • Key elements for assisting people to escape poverty are: jobs with livable wages, education and job training opportunities, affordable child care, before- and after-school programs, food stamp levels that ensure adequate nutrition, and affordable housing opportunities.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.oregonfoodbank.org/images/HFA%202000.pdf **Contact:** Steve Randolph, Project Coordinator, Network Services. Oregon Food Bank, 2540 NE Riverside Way, Portland, OR 97211; Tel: 503-282-0555 x207; E-mail: srandolph@oregonfoodbank.org

AFTER TIME LIMITS: A STUDY OF HOUSEHOLDS LEAVING WELFARE BETWEEN DECEMBER 1998 AND APRIL 1999

November 2000

Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance

Objective	To examine the employment and self-sufficiency outcomes of households leaving welfare, comparing cases closed because time limits were reached with cases closed for reasons other than time limits.
Location and Survey Period	Massachusetts October 1999 – April 2000
Sample	• 670 households (460 time limit closings (TLC) and 210 non-time limit closings (NTLC)) that left welfare between December 15, 1998 and April 30, 1999, and remained off welfare for at least 2 consecutive months. • Approximately 60% of respondents were White; 20% Black; 29% of Latino/Hispanic descent. One-third of TLC respondents and one-quarter of NTLC respondents did not have a high school degree or GED.
Study Design	• Questionnaires administered over the phone (86%) and in person (14%). Respondents were interviewed on average 10 months after leaving welfare. • Food security was assessed using the FSCM "short form." Respondents were surveyed concerning the time period *after* leaving welfare, and then again for the 6 months *before* leaving welfare. • Other questions assessed recipient employment experiences after welfare, other sources of household income, family health, housing, children, assets, debt, use of free food and clothes, and domestic violence.
Key Food Security Findings	***Food security findings:*** • Comparing their food security before and after leaving welfare, respondents across the 2 samples reported increased food insecurity and hunger: overall food insecurity increased by 12.8 percentage points (or 43%) and food insecurity with hunger increased by 7.8 percentage points (or 55%). • The after-welfare levels of food insecurity and hunger for the two groups were similar: 42-43% food insecure and 21-24% food insecure with hunger. • For TLC respondents, reported use of emergency food sites (food pantry, food bank, church or soup kitchen) increased from just over a quarter (26.5%) before welfare to nearly a third (32.7%) after leaving welfare. For the overall sample, the incidence of receiving such food increased from 26 to 29%. • At the time of the interview, 52% of TLC respondents and 29% of NTLC respondents were receiving food stamps (38% of both samples combined), down from 67% and 44%, respectively, from their highest point after leaving welfare. After leaving welfare, 78% of TLC respondents and 67% of NTLC respondents had taken advantage of subsidized school meals for their children. ***Selected non-food security findings:*** • At the time of the interview, 71% of respondents were employed (average hourly wage of $8.46). 18% of respondents reported that they had returned to welfare at some point since leaving welfare; at the time of interview, 8% of TLC respondents and 11% of NTLC respondents reported being on welfare. • About one-quarter of respondents in both groups reported having a serious physical, mental or emotional problem. 16% of TLC respondents and 21% of NTLC respondents said that, after leaving welfare, health problems prevented them from working for at least one month. About half (45 to 52%) of respondents across the two samples had experienced situations indicating domestic violence at some time in their lives. 12 to 15% said that at least one of these situations had happened in the last year.

AFTER TIME LIMITS: A STUDY OF HOUSEHOLDS LEAVING WELFARE BETWEEN DECEMBER 1998 AND APRIL 1999

November 2000

Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance

	• When interviewed, over 80% of households in both groups reported some degree of debt (excluding mortgages), mainly overdue utility bills, credit card debt, and indebtedness to friends and relatives. • Since leaving welfare, over a quarter of respondents had experienced a utility shut off (gas, electricity, heat or telephone), an increase of about a third since the period before leaving welfare.
Conclusions	• A number of households in both the TLC group and the NTLC group showed signs of increased food insecurity after leaving welfare, even though they continued to be eligible for and receive a wide range of publicly-funded income supports. • Both groups had high levels of employment with average hourly earnings appreciably above the minimum wage.
Contact Information	**Report available at**: http://www.state.ma.us/dta/dtatoday/reform/CSR.pdf **Contact**: Dick Powers, MA Department of Transitional Assistance, 600 Washington Street, Boston, MA 02111; Tel: 617-348-8405 **Study authors**: Gloria Nagle with Bruce Goodro

CURRENT AND FORMER WORK FIRST NEW JERSEY CLIENTS: HOW ARE THEY FARING 30 MONTHS LATER?

November 2000

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Objective	To learn how families receiving cash assistance in New Jersey are faring and what has happened to those that have left cash assistance.
Location and Survey Period	New Jersey February – June 2000
Sample	• 1,607 clients who entered Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) between July 1997 and December 1998, the first 18 months of New Jersey's new welfare initiative. • 96% female; 43% with less than a high school diploma; 55% African-American, 24% Hispanic, and 21% White.
Study Design	• The overall WFNJ study is tracking a statewide representative sample of up to 2,000 clients who entered the program between July 1997 and December 1998. 5 rounds of longitudinal surveys are being conducted at 12-month intervals. • This report is based on the 2nd client survey, which included interviews with about 1,600 clients approximately 30 months after entering WFNJ; it also draws on state administrative data and data from the 1st client survey. The FSCM "short form" was administered as part of the 2nd client survey. • The study tracks the circumstances of both those who left TANF and those who remain on cash assistance.
Key Food Security Findings	• 36% of WFNJ client families experienced food insecurity; 13% reported hunger. • WFNJ clients not employed had the highest prevalence of hunger and food insecurity, regardless of whether they had left TANF. Among those still receiving TANF and not employed, 41% were food insecure and 16% experienced hunger. Among those not employed who no longer received TANF benefits, 42% were food insecure and 15% showed evidence of hunger. Even among those who left TANF and were employed, 10% reported hunger. • 3 in 10 TANF leavers received food stamps. Nearly two-thirds of TANF leavers remained eligible for food stamps; about half of those eligible received food stamps. More than one-third of TANF leavers lacked health insurance, and only 1 in 4 employed leavers used child care subsidies. • Among TANF leavers, the prevalence of hunger was lower for those receiving food stamps than for those eligible but not receiving food stamps (8% vs. 19%). • 13% of respondents reported using a food bank, food pantry, or emergency kitchen during the year prior to the survey. • 50% of WFNJ clients had faced at least 1 of 4 serious hardships in the prior year (extreme poverty, serious illness, serious housing crisis, or hunger). A substantially smaller fraction (17%) experienced 2 or more of these hardships in the past year. The rate of hardship was highest for those off TANF and not working. Those on TANF but not employed were also more likely than other clients to experience these hardships, especially serious illness.
Conclusions	• Food insecurity prevalence among WFNJ clients is similar to that of Americans with incomes below the poverty level. • Policy makers should address the low rates of food stamp use among clients who have left welfare.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.mathematica.org/PDFs/wfnj2.pdf **Contact:** Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, New Jersey 08543-2393; Tel: 609-799-3535 **Study authors**: Anu Rangarajan and Robert G. Wood Study submitted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to NJ Department of Human Services.

INDEPENDENT VALIDATION OF THE CORE FOOD SECURITY MODULE WITH ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS

November 2000 / March 2001 (two articles)

Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI; Colorado State University; and University of HI at Manoa

Objective	To assess the "goodness of fit" of the 18-item FSCM in Hawaii where at least half of the population is of Asian or Pacific Islander descent.
Location and Survey Period	Hawaii June – November 1998
Samples	• Convenience sample of 144 food pantry recipients. • A statewide sample of 1469 respondents from the 1998 HI Health Survey.
Study Design	• Assess the robustness of the internal scale construct of the FSCM measure and the hierarchical item ordering using Rasch analysis methods (1). • Compare the HI modal response pattern to the 1995 national modal response pattern (2). • Assess the concurrent validity of alternative measures, including the FSCM, measures adapted from the Radimer/Cornell (RC) measure and the Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project (CCHIP), and a new face-valid measure constructed by the authors (FVFSM) (2).
Key Food Security Findings	• Overall, the FSCM scale measure fits the HI data as well as it did the national data. Findings suggest that the FSCM scale measure demonstrated internal scale construct validity, person-response validity, stability, and item hierarchy consistent with conceptual expectations and previous work (1). However, in HI, the FSCM categorical measure did not reliably or accurately categorize food insecure households based on the face validity of affirmative responses, and most households did not follow a modal response pattern (2). • Inconsistent understanding of the term "balanced meals" in Q4 is likely to affect the reliability and validity of responses to Q4. Rephrasing suggested (1). • FSCM scale measure may not be adequate in differentiating food security from relatively mild food insecurity; the need for additional items indicative of food security and mild food insecurity should be considered. (1) • It is unclear why a single affirmative response to Q2 ("worried that food would run out") should not be sufficient for food insecure categorization (current scoring requires 3 affirmative responses for food insecure categorization) (1). Respondents with only one affirmative response to Q2 (worried about food insecurity) exhibited behaviors consistent with food insecurity (decreased vegetable intake, greater reliance on alternative food resources and low-cost foods) (2). • The use of the proposed 6-item FSCM for food security monitoring appears premature at this time (1). • There was a 6.7 percentage point difference between the percentage of households classified as food secure by the FSCM and the 3 other measures (2). Both the adapted CCHIP and RC measures classified 73 households (4.4%) as experiencing hunger among children; this is more than double the number categorized as "severely hungry" by the FSCM or the alternative measure (FVFSM).
Conclusions	• With the exception of Samoans, findings suggest a promising "ethnic" robustness of the FSCM in HI, and support the potential application of the FSCM to various ethnic groups through the US (1). • Identified weakness in the 18-item scale, gaps in the scale, and the poor fit of some questions require further investigation in applications to other populations (1). • The FSCM appears to underreport the severity of food insecurity across all food security categories (2). • A reassessment of the national FSCM categorical measure appears warranted (2).

INDEPENDENT VALIDATION OF THE CORE FOOD SECURITY MODULE WITH ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS

November 2000 / March 2001 (two articles)

Full Plate, Inc., Kaneohe, HI; Colorado State University; and University of HI at Manoa

Contact Information	**Studies published as**: (1) JP Derrickson, AG Fisher, JEL Anderson. "The Core Food Security Module Scale Measure Is Valid and Reliable When Used with Asians and Pacific Islanders," *Journal of Nutrition*, November 2000, Vol. 130, No. 11: 2666-2674. Abstract available at: http://www.nutrition.org/cgi/content/abstract/130/11/2666 (2) JP Derrickson, AG Fisher, JEL Anderson, AC Brown. "An Assessment of Various Household Food Security Measures in Hawaii Has Implications for National Food Security Research and Monitoring," *Journal of Nutrition*, March 2001, Vol. 131, No. 3: 749-757. Abstract available at: http://www.nutrition.org/cgi/content/abstract/131/3/749 See also: JP Derrickson "Three Years of Food Security Measurement Research in Hawaii," Discussion Paper no. 1226-01, April 2001, Institute for Research on Poverty. Available at: http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/pubs/dp122601.pdf **Contact**: Joda Derrickson, Executive Director, Full Plate, Inc., 44-155-4 Laha Street, Kaneohe, HI 96744; Tel: 808-234-6317; E-mail: laniwai4@pixi.com

THE FAMILY TRANSITION PROGRAM: FINAL REPORT ON FLORIDA'S INITIAL TIME-LIMITED WELFARE PROGRAM

December 2000

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Objective	To assess the effectiveness of Florida's Family Transition Program (FTP) – a welfare reform pilot project combining cash assistance time limits with an array of services – and to compare FTP's impact on families and children to that of AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children).
Location and Survey Period	Escambia County, Florida 4th year of client survey fielded from September 1998–October 1999. Entire survey covered the period 1994 to 1999.
Sample	2,817 single parents who were randomly assigned to either the FTP or AFDC programs from May 1994 to February 1995. 45% White; 52% Black. 40% did not have a high school diploma.
Study Design	• Study compares outcomes for the FTP and AFDC groups. • Study draws on several surveys of FTP and AFDC clients some using administrative data. A survey of 1,729 people was conducted roughly 4 years after random assignment to either group, and included the FSCM "short form."
Key Food Security Findings	• 34% of FTP respondents and 36% of AFDC respondents experienced food insecurity in the 12 months preceding the survey. • 16% of the FTP group and 17% of the AFDC group experienced food insecurity with hunger. Food security differences between FTP and AFDC respondents were not statistically significant. • Almost half of each group reported a severe hardship in at least one area (neighborhood/housing problems, material hardships, use of social services, food insecurity with hunger). 36-40% of respondents reported 1 to 3 "severe hardships." • Food stamps were a significant source of monthly income for respondents, accounting for 15% of income for those continuously employed, 25% for those not working, and 41% for those with inconsistent employment. • 22% of those whose were employed, but whose FTP benefits were terminated, were food insecure with hunger compared to 9.5% of those who were FTP-terminated and not working. Similarly, more working respondents used food banks in the prior 12 months than those not working (23% and 18%, respectively).
Conclusions	• Overall levels of material hardship were relatively high across both groups. • Food insecurity and hunger were much higher for working families that had reached their time limit. • Despite modest income gains earlier in the follow-up period, FTP had no impact on overall material hardship, food security, health insurance coverage, vehicle ownership, or a range of other measures. Household income was virtually the same for the 2 groups at the end of the study period.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://frontpage.mdrc.aa.psiweb.com/Reports2000/Florida-FTP/FTP-Final-FullRpt.pdf **Contact:** Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 19th Floor, 16 East 34 Street, New York, NY 10016-4326; Tel: 212-532-3200 **Study authors:** Dan Bloom, James J. Kemple, Pamela Morris, Susan Scrivener, Nandita Verma, and Richard Hendra Report submitted to the Florida Department of Children and Families.

STUDY OF ARIZONA ADULTS LEAVING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM: FINAL REPORT

December 2000

Abt Associates, Inc.

Objective	To examine the experiences and circumstances of adults who left the Food Stamp Program (FSP) in 1997.
Location and Survey Period	Phoenix metropolitan area, including Maricopa and Pinal Counties May – October 1999
Sample	696 individuals (90 in the ABAWD subgroup, 322 in the TANF subgroup, and 284 in the non-ABAWD non-TANF subgroup).
Study Design	• Food stamp "exiters" were defined as FSP participants who left the program for 2 or more consecutive months in 1997. • Exiters were divided into 3 subgroups: (1) *ABAWDs* (able-bodied adults without dependents not exempt from work requirements, benefit receipt limited to 3 months in a 36-month period); (2) *TANF recipients* who received TANF benefits at some point in the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit; and (3) *non-TANF recipients* (non-ABAWD individuals not receiving TANF benefits during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit). • ABAWD survey respondents appear to be disproportionately better off than the members of this subgroup at large; therefore, the degree of hardship reported by ABAWD respondents may understate actual hardship. • Administrative data from the AZ Department of Economic Security used for information on public assistance receipt and wages. • FSCM "short form" administered.
Key Food Security Findings	• Over half of exiters were food insecure and 23% experienced food insecurity with moderate or severe hunger. • Hunger was most prevalent among the ABAWD subgroup (34%), followed by the TANF subgroup (23%) and the non-TANF subgroup (18%). • Most respondents (62%) received help from friends or family in the year preceding the interview. Emotional support (37%), money (27%) and food (27%) were the most prevalent forms of this help. • 25% of all exiters sought assistance from a food bank, making it the most frequently reported form assistance from a community organization, neighborhood center, or religious organization. • Over half (56%) of exiters experienced some form of hardship in the year preceding the interview. Hardships included difficulties in paying shelter or utility costs and in providing for child care. Most reporting any difficulty had experienced multiple hardships. The prevalence of hardship was highest for the TANF subgroup (63%).
Conclusions	• The high prevalence of hunger found among the ABAWD exiters (34%) is noteworthy: it is more than two times the national prevalence for households at or below 50% of the poverty level (14%) [most ABAWDs have incomes above the poverty level]. • It is important to consider whether exiters who appear self-sufficient, in terms of reduced reliance on public and private support, are able to avoid hardship and deprivation.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efanrr01001/ (Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Program, E-FANRR Number 01-001) **Contact:** Thomas Carlin, Economic Research Service, USDA, E-mail: tcarlin@ers.usda.gov **Study authors:** Gregory Mills and Robert Kornfeld Report prepared by Abt Associates, Inc. under a research grant from the Economic Research Service, USDA.

FOOD STAMP LEAVERS IN ILLINOIS – HOW ARE THEY DOING TWO YEARS LATER? FINAL REPORT

January 2001

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Objective	To examine the experiences and circumstances of those who left food stamps in Illinois in 1997.
Location and Survey Period	Illinois August – November 1997
Sample	497 food stamp leavers (24% ABAWDs, 22% elderly/disabled leavers, 36% TANF families, and 18% non-TANF families).
Study Design	• Food stamp "leavers" were defined as participants who left the FSP program for 2 or more consecutive months in 1997. • The report draws on administrative (N=10,001) and survey (N=497) data. • Survey respondents were interviewed an average of 27 months after exiting the FSP. • Study focuses on how different groups of leavers have fared over time (families, ABAWDs, elderly/disabled, and rural/urban leavers).
Key Food Security Findings	• As a group, food stamp leavers showed considerable food insecurity. 54% of leavers reported food insecurity and 26% reported food insecurity with hunger. • 22% of families, 27% of elderly/disabled, and 33% of ABAWDs were food insecure with hunger (moderate and severe). ABAWDs had the highest level of severe insecurity, with 1 in 10 classified as food insecure with severe hunger (which is 3 times the prevalence of severe hunger among people below the poverty line nationally and 10 times the prevalence of severe hunger among all Americans). • Compared to the cases that left the FSP for income-related reasons or because of administrative hassles, those that left the program due to sanctions or for other reasons were more likely to experience food insecurity with hunger (30-34% vs. 22-23%). • 58% of all food stamp leavers experienced at least one serious hardship in the prior year, including extreme poverty, moderate or severe hunger, serious illness, homelessness, arrest, substance abuse or mental health treatment, violent crime or abuse, or a health problem with no insurance. 33% experienced 2 or more hardships. The most commonly reported hardships were living in extreme poverty, experiencing moderate or severe hunger, and serious illness. ABAWDs were significantly more likely to experience significant hardships than the other 2 groups. • Although the reasons for leaving the FSP varied considerably by household group, over half of all leavers reported that they left because of new employment or an earnings increase, 13% left due to sanctions, 12% for administrative reasons, and 15% for other reasons. • Many food stamp leavers returned to the program: among those who exited in 1997, nearly half had returned to the FSP within 24 months.
Conclusions	• As a group, food stamp leavers had fairly low incomes: 2 years after exiting the FSP, more than half had incomes below the poverty level. ABAWDs were the most likely of all the leaver groups to be living in extreme poverty. Many food stamp leavers reported poor health or other health problems, and less than one-third of ABAWDs had any health insurance. • There is considerable food insecurity among food stamp leavers as a group, particularly ABAWDs. Other serious hardships are fairly common as well, especially among ABAWDs and the elderly/disabled. • Although food stamp caseloads have declined dramatically in IL and nationally in recent years, it is not at all clear that the well-being of those who have left the program has improved. Those exiting due to sanctions are the worst off, suggesting that states should be careful in implementing sanction policies.

FOOD STAMP LEAVERS IN ILLINOIS – HOW ARE THEY DOING TWO YEARS LATER? FINAL REPORT
January 2001
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

	• ABAWDs were more likely than other groups of food stamp leavers to face nearly every hardship examined. Policy makers should explore ways of targeting ABAWDs for services both before and after they leave the FSP. • Food stamp leavers would benefit greatly from increased access to health insurance.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efanrr01002/ **Contact:** Thomas Carlin, Economic Research Service, USDA, tcarlin@ers.usda.gov **Study authors:** Anu Rangarajan and Philip M. Gleason Report submitted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to the Economic Research Service, USDA.

67

ASSESSING THE PREVALENCE OF HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN RHODE ISLAND – YEAR 2000 SUMMARY REPORT

January 2001

Rhode Island Department of Health

Objective	To describe who is at risk of hunger in Rhode Island, estimate the prevalence of hunger and food insecurity prevalence among Rhode Islanders living in poverty areas, and monitor changes in prevalence from 1999 to 2000.
Location and Survey Period	Rhode Island March – May 2000
Sample	• 401 randomly selected households from 41 poverty census tracts (47% of sample resided in Providence). • Although 80% of respondent households had at least one adult working, over half had incomes less than 185% of the poverty level.
Study Design	• Sample based upon a random digit dial telephone list generated for households within the poverty census tracts. Households with no telephone service or an unlisted telephone number were not included in the survey. • Interviewers administered FSCM in English or Spanish, along with additional sociodemographic and program participation questions.
Key Food Security Findings	• 100 households (24.9%) were food insecure. 43 households (or 10.7% of the total sample) were food insecure with moderate or severe hunger. • Food insecurity was significantly associated with: participation in the Food Stamp Program, WIC, or the Family Independence Program (RI's welfare program); no adult employed in the household; Hispanic ethnicity; single parent households; low income; children in the household; less than a 12th grade education; households with 5 or more individuals. • Nearly 1 in 10 households reported using a food pantry or soup kitchen during the previous 12 months. 17% of households received food stamps. • 62% of households receiving food stamp benefits were food insecure compared to 17% of those that did not participate. • From 1999 to 2000, there were no significant changes in the overall food insecurity prevalence of the sampled low-income populations in Rhode Island (24.4% in 1999 vs. 24.9% in 2000). However, the percentage of households classified as food insecure with moderate or severe hunger increased from 8.8% in 1999 to 10.7% in 2000.
Conclusions	• Although the overall prevalence of food insecurity changed little from 1999 to 2000, the percentage of food-insecure households reporting hunger increased: among families defined as food insecure, 43% experienced hunger in the current study compared to 36% the year before. • The risk factors associated with food insecurity in the 2000 survey were essentially identical to those identified in the 1999 survey. • Prevalence estimates of food insecurity in this report may underestimate the real prevalence of food insecurity in the target areas surveyed, as the survey did not capture homeless individuals, those in temporary housing/shelters, and households without phones or listed phone numbers. • Almost 1 in 4 households in the sample were food insecure. Moreover, 1 in 3 families with children were food insecure as well as 42% of single-parent households. The results justify "both the concern and need for action to improve food insecurity in Rhode Island," and in particular suggest the need for increased outreach efforts to increase participation in food and nutrition programs.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.healthri.org/family/foodsecurity2000.pdf **Project Directors:** Bethany Di Napoli (E-mail: Bethanyd@doh.state.ri.us), Samara Viner-Brown (E-mail: samv@doh.state.ri.us). Rhode Island Department of Health, Division of Family Health, Room 302, Cannon Building, Providence, RI 02908-5097; Tel: 401-222-2312

2000 OREGON POPULATION SURVEY

January 2001

Office of Economic Analysis, Oregon Department of Administrative Services and the Oregon Progress Board

Objective	To measure the socioeconomic characteristics and opinions of Oregonians on a biannual basis and, with respect to food security, to replicate the USDA prevalence rates for Oregon which indicated that Oregon had the highest hunger rate in the country.
Location and Survey Period	Oregon Spring and Summer 2000
Sample	3,633 household respondents from a random statewide sample.
Study Design	• Statewide sample was derived using a random digit telephone number sample. A minimum of 400 interviews were conducted from each of Oregon's 9 regions. • Survey included questions on household income, adult educational attainment, health insurance coverage, child care, elder caregiving, in-migration, and a variety of other variables of interest (e.g., public library usage, traffic, computer use, salmon runs, lottery). • Survey included FSCM "short form."
Key Food Security Findings	• 6.5% of household respondents experienced food insecurity and 2.9% experienced hunger.
Conclusions	• The level of food insecurity found among survey respondents appears to be relatively low (6.5%) and well below the level documented by the USDA for the period 1996–1998 (12.6%). • Given the differences between the findings of this study and the USDA's report, further analysis is needed to make conclusions regarding the level of hunger in Oregon.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.oea.das.state.or.us/ops2000/ops2000_report.pdf. Data sets available through http://www.oea.das.state.or.us/ **Contact:** Kanhaiya Vaidya, OR Office of Economic Analysis, DAS; Tel: 503-378-4967; E-mail: kanhaiya.l.vaidya@state.or.us **Study author:** Kanhaiya L. Vaidya

IOWA FAMILIES THAT LEFT TANF: WHY DID THEY LEAVE AND HOW ARE THEY FARING?

February 2001

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Objective	To explain why households have left Iowa's Family Investment Program (FIP) and to describe their circumstances after exiting the program.
Location and Survey Period	Iowa February – June 2000
Sample	401 single-parent families that left FIP in spring 1999 (administrative data available on 958 families)
Study Design	• Families were included in study if they received 3 months of FIP benefits in spring 1999, but no benefits in July and August 1999, and if they were classified as single-parent cases in state administrative records (N=953). • From this sampling frame, families were randomly selected to participate in a telephone survey that gathered information on reasons for leaving FIP, economic status, and family well-being after leaving. Interviews conducted 8-12 months after leaving FIP. • The FSCM "short form" was administered as well as one retrospective question concerning whether the household's food situation after leaving FIP was better or worse than its situation in the month prior to survey interview.
Key Food Security Findings	• Nearly one-third (32%) of respondents were food insecure after leaving FIP. Half of these families experienced hunger. • 28% of families reported receiving assistance from a food pantry after leaving FIP. 3% used a soup kitchen. • Just before leaving FIP, Medicaid and Food Stamp participation rates for FIP families were extremely high – 99% and 85%, respectively. In the 1st month after exit, participation rates dropped by about half, to 57% for Medicaid and 43% for food stamps, and then stayed at these levels for the rest of the year. • 8–12 months after leaving FIP, families had an average monthly income of $1,440. 47% were below the poverty threshold and another 16% were between 101 and 130% of the threshold. More than 1 in 5 families were living in extreme poverty. • Most family heads (88%) felt that their food situation after leaving FIP was about the same or better than it was before they left the program. • About 25% of families were unable to pay their rent at some point after leaving FIP, and about one-quarter doubled up with other families. 7% went without heat or electricity because they could not afford it, and 7% were homeless.
Conclusions	• Almost one-third of families that left FIP in spring 1999 were food insecure after leaving FIP. However, they were no more likely to be food insecure than before they left FIP and no more likely to be food insecure than other families across the nation with similar incomes. • Almost half of the families that left FIP in spring 1999 remained in poverty about 1 year later, indicating that about half of FIP leavers failed to achieve minimal goals for improving their financial well-being. • Generally, the concern that families may experience more hardships in the 1st year after leaving FIP appears to be unfounded. However, a nontrivial proportion of families had difficulties after leaving FIP.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/PDFs/iowaleave.pdf **Contact:** Jacqueline Kauff, Project Director, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 600 Maryland Avenue, SW, Suite 550, Washington, DC 20024; Tel: 609-799-3535 **Study authors:** Jacqueline Kauff, Lisa Fowler, Thomas Fraker, and Julita Milliner-Waddell Report submitted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to the Iowa Department of Human Services.

HUNGER IN SCHENECTADY COUNTY

March 2001

Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.

Objective	To (1) identify the food security status of Schenectady County residents; (2) assess how well food assistance programs meet client nutritional needs; (3) identify gaps and barriers in the service delivery system; and (4) propose recommendations to ensure that services meet clients' needs.
Location and Survey Period	Schenectady County, New York April – December 2000
Sample	227 residents completed telephone interviews; 120 in-person interviews conducted with clients at 5 soup kitchens and food pantries; 105 clients at food pantries completed a nutrition assessment.
Study Design	• Data collected using mail survey of community-based organizations, random telephone survey, in-person surveys with emergency food service recipients as well as nutritional assessments, 8 focus groups with service providers and users, interviews with providers of federally-funded food programs, and analysis of administrative data from federally-funded food programs. • Students from a quantitative methods class at Union College completed 227 telephone interviews from a random sample of 1,800 pre-screened telephone numbers. • Student interviewers, and some staff members, conducted in-person interviews with clients at 5 soup kitchens and food pantries. • 105 clients at 4 food pantries completed a 24-hour diet-recall survey. • Both telephone and in-person surveys included the FSCM.
Key Food Security Findings	**General population:** • 18% of survey respondents were food insecure, with half of those experiencing hunger. • Nearly one-third of households with children were food insecure and 17% experienced hunger (13% moderate hunger, 4% severe hunger). **Emergency food service clients:** • 80% of those who used food pantries and soup kitchens experienced some level of food insecurity. Over half of the respondents (51%) reported experiencing some degree of hunger, and 50% of these experienced severe hunger. • Emergency food user households with children were more food secure than households without children; however, a higher proportion of households with children experienced hunger (29%) than households without children. • Average total caloric intake by food pantry clients was 61% of what is needed for a healthy lifestyle. 45 of the 105 people surveyed consumed less than 50% of what is needed to sustain a healthy lifestyle. Respondents were deficient in Vitamin A, iron, calcium, Vitamin E, and fiber. • From 1991 to 1999, food pantry packages distributed increased by 53% and the number of individuals increased by 28% (duplicated count). Soup kitchen meals increased by 35%.
Conclusions	• Hunger is a significant, growing, and hidden problem in Schenectady County that is well above state and national levels. • Despite a strong national economy and low unemployment levels, there has been a dramatic increase in the use of emergency food programs in the county. • While a majority of residents believe that hunger is a serious problem in their county and report that they support food collection efforts, contributions to the major food drive in the county declined by 35% between 1999 and 2000.

HUNGER IN SCHENECTADY COUNTY

March 2001

Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.

	• At the local level: existing food programs need to be made more accessible to individuals who are working; an easily identifiable central point of information about the location and hours of food programs needs to be created; local food programs need greater financial support and volunteer assistance; and food programs need to tailor their services to clients' cultural differences in food preferences.
Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.ccsnys.org/images/Finalrep.PDF **Contact:** Claire Higgins, Associate Executive Director, Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc., 200 Henry Johnson Boulevard, Albany, NY 12210; Tel: 518-434-9194

MONITORING OUTCOMES FOR CUYAHOGA COUNTY'S WELFARE LEAVERS: HOW ARE THEY FARING?

April 2001

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Case Western Reserve University

Objective	To provide a detailed description of welfare leavers before and after the implementation of welfare reform.
Location and Survey Period	Cuyahoga County, Ohio September 1999 – April 2000
Sample	306 single, female adult parents whose welfare cases closed in the 3rd quarter of 1996 and 1998 for at least 2 consecutive months.
Study Design	• Report focuses on 2 groups of welfare leavers: (1) leavers who exited in the 3rd quarter of 1996 ("pre-TANF" group) and (2) those who exited in the 3rd quarter of 1998 ("post-TANF"). • Two types of data used: (1) longitudinal administrative data for 1996 and 1998 exit cohorts (n=2,794 and 3,357, respectively) and (2) follow-up survey data for a sample of post-TANF leavers (n=306) conducted approximately 14-21 months after exiting. • FSCM "short form" administered to follow-up survey sample to measure the level of food insecurity experienced in the month preceding the interview.
Key Food Security Findings	***Food security findings:*** • 46% of those surveyed from the post-TANF exit cohort experienced food insecurity after leaving welfare; 26% experienced hunger. • Food security varied considerably by respondents' post-exit work and welfare statuses. Hunger was higher among those who did not work during the year following their exit from welfare (34%) and for those that stayed off welfare during the follow-up period (30%). • 10% of respondents indicated that they or someone in their family received food from a charitable organization in the month prior to the interview. • Among 1998 leavers, 56% received food stamps and 69% were covered by Medicaid in the 1st quarter after exit, a 10-20 percentage point increase compared with 1996 leavers' receipt of these supports. Participation in Medicaid and food stamps declined over the 4 quarters of follow-up; however, the decline was greater for 1998 leavers. ***Selected non-food security findings:*** • About 57% of families leaving cash assistance in 1998 lived in households with incomes below the poverty threshold. • Close to one-third of leavers returned to welfare within 12 months of leaving and fewer than one-half of those employed were able to maintain stable employment. • Approximately 40% of survey respondents indicated that someone in their family was unable to access medical and dental care because of a lack of insurance or resources. • 49% of survey respondents reported a "rent burden" (monthly rent and utilities exceeding 30% of total income). A sizable proportion of the sample did not pay market housing costs: 28% lived in public or subsidized housing, 21% were living rent free with families or friends, or in another arrangement where they paid part of the rent. • Among respondents with debt, 40% had over $2000 worth of debt.
Conclusions	• The level of hardship indicated by post-TANF leavers, even among those with steady employment, suggests that leaving welfare does not translate into a higher level of well-being. • Reports of relatively low earnings, high levels of material hardship, and lower than expected take-up rates for food stamps and Medicaid suggest that welfare leavers still deserve the attention of policymakers.

MONITORING OUTCOMES FOR CUYAHOGA COUNTY'S WELFARE LEAVERS: HOW ARE THEY FARING?

April 2001

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Case Western Reserve University

Contact Information	**Report available at:** http://www.mdrc.org/Reports2001/UC-Cuyahoga-WelfareLeavers/UC-Cuyahoga-WelfareLeavers.pdf **Study authors:** Nandita Verma, MDRC and Claudia Coulton, Case Western Reserve University, with Richard Hendra and Engel Polousky Report prepared for Cuyahoga Work and Training and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

FOOD SECURITY AND COMMUNITY: PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

May 2001

Hartford Food System

Objective	To provide updated information on hunger and food insecurity in Hartford and new information about the relationships between food security and community food resources. Also, to examine the contribution that social capital makes to the food security of low-income households.
Location and Survey Period	Hartford, Connecticut May – October 1999
Sample	Random sample of 330 households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level.
Study Design	• Face-to-face interviews conducted in respondents' homes. • Survey instrument included sections that measured food security, social capital, participation in food programs, food shopping behavior, fruit and vegetable consumption, and household demographics. • Food security was measured using the FSCM; social capital assessed using a 7-item scale designed to measure social cohesion and trust; produce consumption measured by asking how often respondents ate each of 8 fruit and vegetable categories.
Key Food Security Findings	• Over half (52%) of respondent households experienced food insecurity during the previous 12 months and 24% experienced food insecurity with hunger. • Although food-secure households were significantly more likely to have at least one member working full-time, almost one-third (31%) of households with hunger had at least one member employed full-time. • Food-secure households had higher levels of social capital (social networks, relationships, and social support), were more likely to be involved in social or civic organizations, and had lived in their residence for a longer period of time. • Among households that experienced hunger, 45% did not received food stamps, 65% did not receive welfare, 67% did not go to a food pantry, 78% did not go to a soup kitchen, and 37% of households with children under 5 did not participate in the WIC program. • Less than half of participants in the Food Stamp Program, TANF, School Breakfast Program, Summer Food Program, Senior Meal Program, food pantries, and soup kitchens were food secure. Respondents who participated in the Food Stamp Program, food pantries, and soup kitchens were significantly more likely than non-participants to be food insecure. • 26% of respondents went to a food pantry in the previous 12 months, and 12% ate a meal at a soup kitchen. • Households that buy most of their food at medium-sized grocery stores or small corner stores were significantly more likely to be food insecure. • Households that experienced severe hunger consumed far fewer fruits and vegetables than food secure households. • Predictors of food security include: frequent shopping at large supermarkets, income above the poverty line, non-use of food pantries and soup kitchens, and high social capital. Race and ethnicity were not significant predictors of food security.
Conclusions	• Low-income households in Hartford experience high levels of food insecurity and hunger. • Many of the most food insecure households are not receiving assistance from available food resources; however, participation in food programs does not ensure household food security. • Lack of adequate supermarkets, paired with the high percentage of households without a car, make access to food a major challenge. • Social capital (trust, community involvement, and social networks) is positively related to food security.

FOOD SECURITY AND COMMUNITY: PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

May 2001

Hartford Food System

Contact Information	**Contact:** Hartford Food System, 509 Wethersfield Avenue, Hartford, CT 06114; Tel: 860-296-9325; E-mail: info@hartfordfood.org **Study author:** Katie Martin, Research Director, Hartford Food System

Technical Summaries of National Food Security Studies

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	1995 FEDERAL FOOD SECURITY STUDY	FOOD STAMP PARTICIPANTS' FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY
Researchers	USDA/Abt Associates, Tufts University Center on Hunger and Poverty, Cornell University Division of Nutritional Sciences, C.A.W. and Associates.	Mathematica Policy Research
Release date (survey period)	September 1997 (April 1995)	July 1999 (June 1996 - January 1997)
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in households.	Nationally representative sample of Food Stamp Program (FSP) participants, and FSP-eligible and near-eligible nonparticipants.
Annual income	Relative to federal poverty line: 16% of households under 1.0, 35% under 1.85, and 65% 1.85 and over.	*FSP participant households*: $8,468 (average) *FSP-eligible*: $9,953 (average) *Near-eligible*: $14,906 (average)
Race/ethnicity	84.4% White; 12.0% Black; 7.7% Hispanic (Hispanic persons can be of any race).	*FSP participants*: 32.7% African American; 16.1% Hispanic; 46.9% White, non-Hispanic. *FSP-eligible*: 16.8% African American; 14.9% Hispanic; 64.7% White, non-Hispanic. *Near-eligible*: 11.6% African American; 14.1% Hispanic; 69.7% White, non-Hispanic
Type of households	38% of households with children; 28% households with elderly, no children; 34% households with no elderly or children.	FSP households more likely to contain children (63.5%) and be single-parent households (34.9%). FSP participants more likely to be ages 20-49 (67.3%), and not completed high school (43.1%).
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	44,730 households (53,700) of which 18,370 households passed screening questions and were asked full battery of food security questions.	3,309 (2,454 FSP participants, 450 FSP-eligible nonparticipants, 405 near-eligible nonparticipants for overall response rate of 60%)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	Large battery of food security items administered as first Food Security Supplement to regular Current Population Survey (CPS). FSCM constitutes systematic set of 18 questions with strongest statistical properties.	FSCM
Additional Instrument Items	Race/ethnicity, income, household relationship, geographic region.	Questions related to broader food insufficiency, coping mechanisms, and perceived reasons for food insecurity. 7-day food use and shopping behavior data collected in-person for 957 FSP respondents.

Sampling and data collection design	- CPS is a probability sample based on stratified sampling design. Design is state-based, with primary sampling units consisting of counties or groups of counties. Overall sample selected from lists of housing unit addresses obtained from most recent decennial census, updated for new construction. - Complete Food Security Supplement instrument administered to all households with incomes at or below 185% of federal poverty level, and to all households with higher incomes that passed screener questions.	2 sampling frames used: administrative lists of FSP participants and random-digit-dialing (RDD) frame of all U.S. households with telephones. In-person interviews with 957 randomly selected FSP respondents completed in 35 randomly selected primary sampling units (PSUs). Nonparticipants from RDD frame selected based on short screening interview.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Mostly telephone interviews with household heads.	In-person and/or telephone interviews with household member.
Other features	Special weights computed to adjust final supplement sample for the demographic characteristics of supplement non-interviews.	Study provides first reliable national measures of nutrient availability for FSP participants based on household food use data in over a decade.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	1995-1998 FEDERAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES (ADVANCE REPORT)	SHORT FORM OF THE HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY SCALE
Researchers	Food and Nutrition Service, USDA	National Center for Health Statistics/ and Abt Associates
Release date (survey period)	July 1999 (April 1995, September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998)	August 1999 (April 1995)
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Representative sample of US civilian non-institutionalized population living in households.	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in households
Annual income	See Report Tables 2A-2D	
Race/ethnicity	See Report Tables 2A-2D	
Type of households	See Report Tables 2A-2D	
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	Approximately 40,000 each year.	44,730 households (53,700) of which 18,370 households passed screening questions and were asked full battery of food security questions.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	Selected a robust 6-item subset of the 18-item instrument to be used when time and financial constraints preclude the use of the full FSCM.
Additional instrument items	Race/ethnicity, income, household relationship, geographic region.	
Sampling and data collection design	CPS is a probability sample based on stratified sampling design. Design is state-based, with primary sampling units consisting of counties or groups of counties. Overall sample selected from lists of housing unit addresses obtained from most recent decennial census, updated for new construction.	Analyzed data from April 1995 CPS Food Security Supplement.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Mostly telephone interviews with household heads.	

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	PREVALENCE OF FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER, BY STATE, 1996-1998	DOES IT COST LESS TO LIVE IN RURAL AREAS?
Researchers	Economic Research Service, USDA	Economic Research Service, USDA and University of Wisconsin-Madison
Release date (survey period)	September 1999/Addendum released August 2000 (September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998)	March 2000 (March and April 1995)
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in households in each state.	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in households.
Annual income		Not given.
Race/ethnicity		Not given.
Type of households		Not given.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	122,834 households over 3 years (CPS data)	20,698 (44,730) (CPS data)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM
Additional instrument items	Income, geographic region, food stamp use.	Race/ethnicity, income, household relationship, geographic region.
Sampling design	Analyzed data from CPS Food Security Supplements in September 1996, April 1997, and August 1998. Data from three years combined to improve reliability of state prevalence estimates.	Matched March and April 1995 CPS files to obtain precise income and demographic information. Households removed from sample if not available for an interview in March, moved between March and April, changed composition, contained unrelated subfamilies or individuals, or lacked metro / nonmetro residence information (unless households were in RI, UT, or WY, where households were assigned nonmetro status). Sample further restricted to households with income > 0.5 times the poverty level and <5 times the poverty level.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Mostly telephone interviews with household heads.	Mostly telephone interviews with household heads.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	DECLINE IN FOOD STAMP USE BY RURAL LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS	1999 FEDERAL FOOD SECURITY STUDY
Researchers	Economic Research Service, USDA	Economic Research Service, USDA
Release date (survey period)	September 2000 (April 1995 and April 1999)	September 2000 (April 1999)
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Representative sample of low-income U.S. households.	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in households.
Annual income	130% of the poverty line or below.	Relative to federal poverty line: 10.8% of households under 1.0; 26% under 1.85; 61% 1.85 and over.
Race/ethnicity	Not given.	75.5% White; 12.1% Black; 8.7% Hispanic (of any race); 3.7% other non-Hispanic.
Type of households	Not given for overall sample. Household characteristics provided based on food stamp receipt and food security status.	36.2% of households with children under 18.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	About 44,000 in each year (1995 and 1999)	47,500
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM
Additional instrument items	Income, household composition, food stamp receipt, geographic location (metro vs. nonmetro)	Race/ethnicity, income, household relationship, geographic region.
Sampling design	CPS Food Security Supplement data analyzed.	CPS is a probability sample based on stratified sampling design. Design is state-based, with primary sampling units consisting of counties or groups of counties. Overall sample selected from lists of housing unit addresses obtained from most recent decennial census, updated for new construction.
Type of survey site (number of sites)		Mostly telephone interviews with household heads.
Other features	Calculates food insecurity and hunger prevalence for low-income households by receipt and non-receipt of food stamps and by type of household.	To achieve strict comparability across years, data from 1995, 1998, and 1999 were adjusted post hoc to 1996-1997 screening rules.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	HUNGER DECLINES IN RURAL HOUSEHOLDS
Researchers	Economic Research Service, USDA
Release date (survey period)	December 2000 (April 1995, September 1996, April 1997, August 1998)
RESPONDENTS	
Target group	Representative sample of U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population living in rural households.
Annual income	
Race/ethnicity	Reported by food security status, not for overall sample.
Type of households	Reported by food security status, not for overall sample.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	Not given.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD	
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM
Additional instrument items	Race/ethnicity, income, age, household structure, geographic region.
Sampling design	CPS Food Security Supplement data analyzed.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	
Other features	Households classified as having child hunger if household responded "yes" to at least 5 of the 8 items in the FSCM that ask specifically about children's experiences of food stress.

Technical Summaries of State and Local Food Security Studies

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	REPRESENTATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD OF DETROIT	LEGAL IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS IN TWO CALIFORNIA COUNTIES
Researchers	Detroit Hunger Action Coalition / Center for Urban Studies, Wayne State University	CA Food Policy Advocates
Release date (study period)	March 1998 (October 1996 and January 1997)	May 1998 (November 1997 – March 1998)
Location	Michigan: Detroit	California: 2 counties (LA and San Francisco)
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Representative neighborhood of Detroit	Legal immigrants
Annual income	67% with incomes below $20,000.	Very low income.
Race/Ethnicity	89% Black	In LA, 70% from Mexico, Central/South America. In SF, 48% from East or Southeast Asia, and 30% from former Soviet Union.
Gender/Age	73% female	
Type of household	60% with children	Households with and without children.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	352	1020 (LA: 376 in 11/97; 403 in 3/98; SF: 241 in 1/98)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM
Additional instrument items	Demographic, economic characteristics.	Follow-up questions on period since food stamp cuts (9/1/97).
Survey translated?	No.	Yes, into 6 languages.
Sampling and data collection design	Used 1990 Census data to select neighborhood that reflects Detroit demographics. Household sample identified through block listing and random sampling.	Case-control study with random sample drawn from food stamp households with at least 1 noncitizen member and which were scheduled for recertification or verification interviews during 3 specified months.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Door-to-door interviews, primarily with household head.	Welfare department office (5)
Interviewers	Interviewers (25) recruited from community and HAC staff. Trained by CUS evaluation staff; paid $7.50 per hour.	County eligibility workers
Other features	Center for Urban Studies consulted on sampling design, and did data entry and analysis.	• Second LA survey conducted 5 months later permitting analysis of impact of food stamp cuts over time. • Used food stamp participation data along with hunger rates to produce estimate of numbers of food insecure and hungry children.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	AT-RISK HOUSEHOLDS IN GREEN BAY, WI	HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING EMERGENCY FOOD AID IN 12 CALIFORNIA COUNTIES
Researchers	University of WI Cooperative Extension / Brown County Food and Hunger Network	CA Food Policy Advocates
Release date (study period)	May 1998 (April/May 1998)	June 1998 (April - May 1998)
Location	Wisconsin: Green Bay	California: 12 counties, urban & rural
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Households at risk of food insecurity and using food assistance programs including emergency sites.	Households seeking emergency food and other charitable services.
Annual income	Not asked.	Very low income (median monthly income =
Race/Ethnicity	57% White, 21% Asian, 9% Hispanic, 4% Black. Large proportion of Asian and Hispanic households likely to be immigrants.	Approximately 25% from Mexico; remaining respondents U.S. citizens.
Gender/Age	77% female; 55% between ages of 19-39; 15%	64% female; mean age = 42 years old.
Type of household	66% families with children.	Households with and without children.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	356 (493)	823 (1,015)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM
Additional instrument items	Demographic, education, mode of travel to site, stability of residence. Income level not asked out of sensitivity to respondents.	Demographic and income questions plus information on food stamp use.
Survey translated?	Yes. Hmong & Hispanic interpreters.	Yes.
Sampling and data collection design	Purposive. All private and public food assistance sites in city invited to participate, of which 15 accepted. Annual number of families using sites established, sample drawn with random procedures.	Pooled random sample of clients at 26 sites in 12 counties across the state.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Meal sites, schools, food pantries, WIC, elderly housing (21)	Emergency food and charitable social service agencies (26)
Interviewers	Social Work students in their senior year at Univ. of WI-Green Bay	Agency employees or volunteers
Other features	• Follow-up study conducted 1 year later. • Good summary of factors affecting response rate. • Prevalence of food insecurity by selected characteristics calculated (e.g., gender, age, education, type and size of household, ethnic background, and health concerns).	Study made possible by collaboration with Catholic Charities of CA, which provided CFPA with a list of member agencies with staffing and experience necessary to comply with study protocol. Two other organizations also agreed to participate.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	FOOD INSECURITY AND HUNGER AMONG FAMILIES USING FOOD BANKS	HUNGER IN KANSAS
Researchers/Sponsor	Tarasuk, Beaton / University of Toronto	St. Peter, Bourdon / Kansas Health Institute
Release date (study period)	March/April 1999 (May 1996 - April 1997)	August 1999 (April 1995)
Location	Canada: Metropolitan Toronto	Kansas
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Women in families receiving emergency food assistance.	Representative sample of civilian non-institutionalized population living in households in Kansas.
Annual Income	Average = 52.8% of the poverty line.	(not reported)
Race/Ethnicity	46% White; 27% Black; 11% Latin American; 10% Asian. 20% recent immigrants.	(not reported)
Gender/Age	100% female; mean age = 33 years old.	(not reported)
Type of household	Households with children; 65% single parents.	(not reported)
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	153 (224)	Secondary analysis of data on 571 Kansas households in April 1995 CPS dataset.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	30-day and 12-month scale items from FSCM	FSCM
Additional items	24-hour dietary intake recall and questionnaire; household demographics; perceived health; health-related behaviors; food acquisition and provisioning practices.	See Technical Summary for "1995 Federal Food Security Study"
Survey translated?	No; sufficient English to participate in oral interviews required.	
Sampling and data collection design	Participants recruited from a stratified random sample of emergency food programs in Metro Toronto. Agency recruitment quotas set in proportion to number of people served in each stratum.	Estimates weighted to be representative of entire Kansas population.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Emergency food assistance programs (21); interviews typically conducted in home settings.	
Interviewers		
Other features / comments	3 interviews conducted within 3-week period following recruitment.	• Pilot use of 1 year of national CPS data to analyze state food security. Small sample size limits analysis. • Estimates are presented for persons, not households, under the assumption that food security status of households can be assigned to each individual in the household.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	FOOD SECURITY IN GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN	FOOD SECURITY AMONG LOUISIANA'S RURAL WELFARE POPULATION
Researchers	Dethlefs, Kok, Early / University of Wisconsin – Cooperative Extension	Monroe, Tiller, Blalock / Louisiana State University
Release date (study period)	September 1999 (Spring 1999)	October 1999 (Fall 1997 – Spring 1999)
Location	Green Bay, Wisconsin	Louisiana
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Households at risk of food insecurity that use programs serving low-income individuals.	Former and soon-to-be former female welfare recipients in rural Louisiana.
Annual Income	Median wage = $7.50 per hour	Not given.
Race/Ethnicity	63% Caucasian; 14% Hispanic; <10% Hmong, Russian, Native American, and African American.	86.5% African American; 11.5% Caucasian; 1.9% Native American.
Gender/Age	83% female; age varied by site (median age at meal sites = 42; food pantries = 36; WIC = 25).	100% women; mean age = 30 (range: 19 to 48 years old).
Type of household	48% lived in households with 4 or more people; 78% resided in households with children.	92.3% unmarried; 51.9% lived with parent(s) or other relative; mean number of children = 2.7 (50.0% had 1-2 children, 42.3% had 3-4 children); 21% receiving TANF assistance; 86.5% receiving food stamp benefits.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	566 (760)	84 in 1^{st} round; 52 in follow-up interviews.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	"Short Form"
Additional items	Demographic information, perceived reasons for food insecurity, and potential benefits of food assistance initiatives.	Participation in education, training, or work; status of government benefit receipt; worries about medical care, housing, and family's long-term future.
Survey translated?	Hmong, Spanish, and Russian interpreters.	No.
Sampling and data collection design	Sites chosen that serve low-income individuals and that had program participants on-site during the survey time period. At 3 sites, interviewers sampled every other household; every available person was asked to participate at all other sites.	Initial sample drawn from 7 parishes at sites where women participated in GED classes or training programs. Sample contacted by mail and on foot for follow-up interviews. Qualitative interviews conducted in-person.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	10 sites: meal sites (2), food pantries (6), WIC offices (2)	Respondent or neighbor's home, porch, or yard.
Interviewers	25 undergraduate Social Work students from the University of WI-Green Bay	Researchers went in pairs, with one interviewer and one note taker.
Other features / comments	• Each interview lasted about 10-15 minutes. Small incentives (such as boxes of cereal bars and pen and paper sets) were used to increase response rates. • Data weighted because probability of any given household being selected varied by site and because some respondents visited more than one type of site.	• $10 paid for completion of interview. • Interviews took 60 – 90 minutes to complete. • All interviews tape recorded and transcribed.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN RHODE ISLAND – 1999	FACE VALIDITY OF THE CORE FOOD SECURITY MODULE WITH ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS
Researchers	Rhode Island Department of Public Health	Derrickson, Anderson / Kaneohe, Hawaii and Colorado State University
Release date (study period)	November 1999 (March – April 1999)	January/February 2000 (Fall 1998)
Location	Rhode Island	Oahu, Hawaii
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Households in poverty census tracts	Food gatekeepers of households with children recruited from food pantries of Head Start preschools.
Annual Income	More than two-thirds (68%) with incomes below $26,000.	31% with household income < $10,000; 10% with income>$35,000.
Race/Ethnicity	76% White; 4% Black/African-American, 5% Asian; 15% Hispanic or Latino origin.	38% Hawaiian; 21% Caucasian; 23% Filipino; 18% Samoan.
Gender/Age	Not given / Average age = 48.4.	95% female
Type of household	56% had 1 or 2 members; 10% had 5 or more members. 38% had children under 21 living in the household.	Predominantly dual-parent households with more than 1 child. Average household size = 6 people.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	410 (3,500)	61 participants in 9 focus groups.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM plus 4 open-ended questions about food sufficiency.
Additional items	Sociodemographic information, employment status.	Demographic information, participation in assistance programs, household income.
Survey translated?	Spanish.	Verbally, for one Samoan participant.
Sampling and data collection design	Randomized digit dial telephone list generated for households within RI's 41 poverty census tracts (1990 Census). When households were contacted by phone, interviewers requested to speak to household head, defined as the person usually responsible for buying household food. Interviews were only completed if the head of the household was available at that time.	Ethnically stratified convenience sample.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Respondents contacted via telephone at home.	Focus groups.
Interviewers	Department of Health staff and volunteers.	Focus groups moderated by a project investigator and either a trained student assistant or a staff member of the agency from which the group was formed.
Other features / comments	• First year pilot survey of Rhode Island Food Security Monitoring Project. • 1990 poverty census tracts provided to Survey Sampling, Inc. which generated telephone lists.	Focus groups yielded information on causes and consequences of food insecurity, coping strategies, plus cognitive testing results on use of FSCM instrument.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	CONCURRENT VALIDITY AND INDEPENDENT VALIDATION OF THE FSCM WITH ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS IN HAWAII	POOR, MOTHER-HEADED FAMILIES IN FOUR U.S. CITIES
Researchers	Derrickson, Fisher, Anderson /Kaneohe, HI, University of HI at Manoa, Colorado State University	Polit, London, Martinez / Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
Release date (study period)	March and November 2000, March 2001 [3 articles] (June – November 1998)	May 2000 (Survey: March 1998 – March 1999; Ethnographic Surveys: late 1998)
Location	Hawaii	Cuyahoga, OH (Cleveland); Los Angeles, CA; Miami-Dade, FL; and Philadelphia, PA
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Low-income Asian and Pacific Islanders in Hawaii.	Female household heads currently or previously receiving cash welfare benefits and who were living in high poverty or high welfare receipt urban areas.
Annual Income	6.9% earned less than $5,000; 13.5% earned between $5,000 and $19,900; 28.9% earned over $54,900.	Average monthly household income for women who worked and received no welfare benefits: $1,700. Average monthly income for women who received welfare but did not work: $936.
Race/Ethnicity	38.3% Caucasian; 16.4% Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian; 12.4% Filipino; 18.3% Japanese; 1.1% Samoan.	68% African-American; 25% Hispanic; 5% White, non-Hispanic.
Gender/Age	Not given.	All women; ages range from 18 – 45; average age = 34.
Type of household	40.2% of respondents lived in adult-only households; 18.5% were single.	Average household size = 4.2; average number of own children in house = 2.4; 47% of respondents lived in households with children under 6.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	1469 from 1998 HI Health Survey. 144 food pantry recipients.	3,765 plus 67 in-depth ethnographic interviews.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM plus 4-part food insufficiency question.	FSCM
Additional items	Demographic information, resource augmentation questions, two diet quality indices.	Employment and welfare history, income, basic demographics, health, material hardship, and receipt of food assistance.
Survey translated?	Not specified.	Not specified.
Sampling and data collection design	Sample consisted of the following: (1) convenience sample of 144 food pantry clients; (2) 61 of the 144 respondents who completed the FSCM a second time, and (3) a statewide sample of 1,469 collected from the 1998 Hawaii Health Survey (HHS). Food pantry respondents were identified from 3 nonprofit charitable food providers. HHS households were randomly chosen from phone books. Households in the counties of Maui and the Big Island of Hawaii were oversampled for the HHS.	Survey Respondents: Using administrative records, sample randomly selected from recipients of food stamps and/or cash welfare benefits living in census tracts (in specified cities) where the poverty or welfare receipt rate exceeded 30% and 20%. Resulting sample consisted of 3,960 respondents or about 1,000 per site. For this report, only women who received cash welfare benefits at some point in their lives (95% of the overall sample) were included. Ethnographic study: Sample was drawn from 3 high-poverty neighborhoods within each of the 4 cities. This report included data from 2 sites: Cleveland and Philadelphia.

Type of survey site (number of sites)	Telephone survey.	Not specified.
Interviewers	Interviewers experienced in calling limited-resource households.	Not specified.
Other features	• Methodological emphasis • Rasch analysis methods used.	• Child-specific scale calculated based on 8 FSCM items that concern children's nutritional status. • Ethnographic study provides rich qualitative information on household coping strategies for ensuring adequate food.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	CALAVERAS COUNTY HUNGER REPORT	LEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN 3 STATES: CALIFORNIA, TEXAS, & ILLINOIS
Researchers	Westernoff, Martin / Human Resources Council, Inc. and University of California Cooperative Extension – Calaveras County	Physicians for Human Rights / Boston Medical Center, Natividad Medical Center, Weiss Memorial Hospital
Release date (study period)	August 2000 (May – October 1999)	October 2000 (May 1998)
Location	Calaveras County, California	California, Texas, & Illinois: 4 cities
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Calaveras County residents using social service and emergency food programs.	Low-income legal immigrants
Annual Income	Average annual cash income = $16,248 (134 households reporting)	73% reported income below the poverty line.
Race/Ethnicity	95% White; 3% American Indian/Alaskan Native; 2% Hispanic.	78% Asian and 69% Latino
Gender/Age	93% female; average age = 33 years old.	
Type of household	Average of 3.75 people per household; 81% of respondents lived in households with children under 18; 70.4% lived in households that had 2 or more adults.	Households with and without children.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	159 (174)	630 (672)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	FSCM
Additional items	Items from 1987 University of California Hunger Survey, including information on participation in food programs, household income and spending, and emergency food assistance receipt	Demographic, health, housing, use of public benefits, income.
Survey translated?	No.	Yes, into Spanish and Vietnamese.
Sampling and data collection design	Survey sites representative of the county's 5 main geographic areas.	Convenience sample of people attending clinics and multi-service centers. Quota set at 100 Latino and Asian legal immigrants from each state (CA contributed 200 Latinos and 100 Asians).
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Child care provider (1); Head Start Preschool (7); WIC (5); human service programs, churches, and emergency food providers (10)	Hospitals, clinics, and community centers (13).
Interviewers	Survey self-administered; trained volunteers and workers distributed survey.	Physicians, and clinic and service agency personnel (social workers and dieticians).
Other features / comments	• Report presents "Recommendations for a Community Action Plan." • Information presented on increase in emergency food assistance.	• 2 focus groups conducted with legal Latino and Vietnamese immigrants in Massachusetts. • Cross-state study.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	OKLAHOMA TANF LEAVERS REPORT	POVERTY AND HUNGER IN OREGON
Researchers	Oklahoma Dept. of Human Services	Oregon Food Bank
Release date (study period)	October 2000 (February – May 2000)	October 2000 (Spring 2000)
Location	Oklahoma	Oregon and Clark County, Washington
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Former welfare recipients, and current welfare recipients with the general Oklahoma low-income population as the comparison group.	People who received a food box during target 2-week period from the Oregon Food Bank Network of Regional Coordinating Agencies.
Annual Income	*Monthly* earned and unearned income: ***Population with income <200% of poverty*: $1,700** *Stayers*: $1,850 *Leavers*: $1,450	Median annual income was $8000 (compared to $40,321 for Oregon). 80% of households surveyed lived below the 2000 Federal Poverty Level.
Race/Ethnicity	*Population with income <200% of poverty*: 11.3% African-American; 11.7% Native American; 1.8% Hispanic/Latino *Stayers*: 37.6% African-American; 14.1% Native American; 2.8% Hispanic/Latino *Leavers*: 25.9% African-American; 11.8% Native American; 3.7% Hispanic/Latino	77% White, 10% Hispanic; 3.8% Native American, 3.2% Black; 4.7% mixed
Gender/Age	*Population with income <200% of poverty*: Female-headed households: 36.5% / Age not given *Stayers*: Female-headed households: 79.4% / Age not given *Leavers*: Female-headed households: 76.8% / Age not given	67% female; average age = 41 years old; 41% of respondent household members were children under 18; 4.8% of recipients were 65 or older.
Type of household	*Population with income <200% of poverty*: Average household size: 3.8; Percent married: 5.9% *Stayers*: Average household size: 3.8; Percent married: 1.7% *Leavers*: Average household size: 3.4; Percent married: 5.0%	55% of households contained children; 23% were headed by single parents; 32% were headed by two-parent households. Average household size = 3.14.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	852 current and former TANF households (3,600) and 222 general low-income population households.	4400 surveys distributed; 3299 completed and used for analysis.
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	"Short Form"	"Short Form" plus 1 additional food security question.
Additional items	Employment, earnings, receipt of public assistance, child care, health care, demographics.	Demographic profile, income and employment, child care, education, housing, health, participation in federal programs.
Survey translated?	Not specified.	Spanish, Russian, and Romanian.

Sampling and data collection design	Random sample of 3,600 clients in open, closed, or denied status at some time between October 1, 1998 and September 30, 1999 (equal numbers of each group sampled). Sample stratified by urban/rural status of the county. 603 general population households with children were also interviewed from a random digit dial sample of 1,823. For the low-income comparison group, used the subset (n=222) of general population households with total income below 200% of federal poverty line.	86 of 304 emergency food box agencies selected for participation. Using sampling method developed for the 1996 Oregon Hunger Factors Assessment Survey, 68 of 86 agencies chosen based on stratified cluster sampling reflecting geography (5 regions) and agency size. Additional 18 agencies added by random selection.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Telephone survey	Emergency food box distributing agencies (86).
Interviewers	Interviews contracted out to Bureau for Social Research at Oklahoma State University.	Self-administered.
Other features	Survey respondents provided $15 incentive payment.	• Training packets on survey distribution were sent to all participating agencies. • Completion of the survey not required for food box receipt.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	MA HOUSEHOLDS LEAVING WELFARE	CURRENT AND FORMER WFNJ CLIENTS
Researchers	MA Dept. of Transitional Assistance (DTA)	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Release date (study period)	November 2000 (October 1999 – April 2000)	November 2000 (February – June 2000)
Location	Massachusetts	New Jersey
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Households that left welfare between December 15, 1998 and April 30, 1999, remained off welfare for at least 2 consecutive months, and were not child-only cases.	Individuals who entered the Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) program between July 1997 and December 1998.
Annual Income	Cases closed due to time limits: $13,156; non-time limit closings: $15,496	Average *monthly* earnings for employed respondents: on TANF, $1,028; off TANF, $1,341.
Race/Ethnicity	60% White; 20% Black; 29% of Latino/Hispanic descent.	55% African-American; 24% Hispanic; 21% White.
Gender/Age	95% female / Average age = 33	96% female / Average age = 30
Type of household	56% of households included another adult besides the respondent; 31% included 2 other adults.	79% single-parent households; average number of children = 2; 67% had a child under 6 years old.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	670 (460 of 620 time-limit (TL) closings, 210 of 310 non-time-limit (NTL) closings). 75% response rate.	1,607 (2000)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	"Short Form"	"Short Form"
Additional items	Employment, income, child support, living arrangements, child care, well-being, family health, and transportation.	Employment history, health status, hardship measures, potential employment barriers, and use of benefits post-TANF.
Survey translated?	Yes, Spanish. 20 interviews conducted in a language other than English or Spanish using an English-speaking member of the respondent's household as a translator.	Unknown.
Sampling and data collection design	Population was defined as all cases closed from Dec. 1998 to Feb. 1999 plus cases requesting an extension if closed by April 30, 1999. From this universe of 10,480 cases, DTA randomly selected 1,066 NTL cases and 1,634 TL cases (TL cases oversampled) and these cases delivered for further examination and subsampling. Final sample consisted of 620 TL cases and 310 NTL cases. Respondents interviewed an average of 10 months after leaving welfare.	Representative statewide sample of case heads who entered WFNJ between July 1997 and December 1998. Respondents interviewed approximately 30 months after entering program. Administrative data also used for some analyses.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	In-person interviews conducted on field visits to respondent's home. One-third of completed telephone interviews required a field visit for completion.	Not specified
Interviewers	15 trained ("briefed") interviewers.	Not specified

Other features / comments	• Survey conducted by Center for Survey Research (CSR) at University of MA-Boston. • Questionnaire pretested in 2 places. • 577 interviews completed on telephone, many requiring field activity. 93 interviews in person. Interviews averaged 57 minutes in length. • Respondents paid $50 for participation. • FSCM "Short Form" administered twice: 1st for time period after welfare; then for 6 months before leaving welfare.	• Study compares the circumstances of clients remaining on cash assistance with those who have left TANF. • 5 rounds of longitudinal surveys are being conducted at 12-month intervals. This report is based on the 2nd client survey.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	FLORIDA'S TIME-LIMITED WELFARE PROGRAM	STUDY OF ARIZONA ADULTS LEAVING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM
Researchers	Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)	Abt Associates, Inc.
Release date (study period)	December 2000 (August 1998 – October 1999)	December 2000 (May – October 1999)
Location	Escambia County, Florida	Phoenix metro area, including Maricopa and Pinal Counties
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Applicants for cash assistance who met FTP's eligibility criteria and who were not exempt.	Adults who left the FSP in 1997. 3 groups: ABAWD, TANF, non-TANF.
Annual Income	54% earned $0; 19% earned $1-$999; 16% earned $1,000 -$4,999; 12% earned $5,000 or more.	Average monthly household income: $1,473, including earned and unearned income.
Race/Ethnicity	45% White; 52% Black; 1% Hispanic.	ABAWD subgroup: 51% White; 21% African American; 20% Hispanic. TANF subgroup: 34% White; 15% African American; 43% Hispanic. Non-TANF subgroup: 47% White; 7% African American; 41% Hispanic
Gender/Age	97% female / Average age = 29.	ABAWD: 70% male TANF: 85% female Non-TANF: 55% female For age distributions, see report, pages 24-26.
Type of household	100% single parents; Average number of children = 2; 42% of respondents had children 2 years and under.	62% of those in ABAWD subgroup were either living alone or with 1 other person, compared to 35% for non-TANF subgroup and 11% for TANF subgroup.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	1,729 (2,160) for 4-year client survey	696 (1,284)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	"Short Form"	FSCM
Additional items	Employment, household income, child well-being, home environment, child care, parenting, and material hardships.	Public and private benefit receipt; employment, child care, employment, education and training, family well-being and support.
Survey translated?	Not specified.	Not specified.
Sampling and data collection design	Participants randomly assigned to either the FTP group or Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) group. Four-year survey sample included all 2,160 people who were randomly assigned to either group between August 1994 and February 1995. Respondents were interviewed an average of 51 months after random assignment.	Stratified random sample of adult exiters who left FSP in 1997 and remained off for 2 consecutive months. Administrative data for period January 1997 – March 1999 used for information on public assistance receipt and wages. Survey data appears to exhibit nonresponse bias. Interviews conducted about 2 years after FSP exit.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Not specified.	Telephone interviews (389) and field interviews (307).
Interviewers	Survey firm under contract to MDRC.	Not specified.
Other features		Survey respondents provided $20 incentive payment.

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	FOOD STAMP LEAVERS IN ILLINOIS	HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN RHODE ISLAND – 2000
Researchers	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.	Rhode Island Department of Health
Release date (study period)	January 2001 (August – November 1999)	January 2001 (March – May 2000)
Location	Illinois	Rhode Island
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Households that left the FSP in Illinois in 1997. 3 types: families, ABAWDS, and elderly/disabled.	Households in poverty census tracts.
Annual Income	Average monthly household income: $1,080 including earned and unearned income.	More than two-thirds (72%) with incomes below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). 26% with incomes below 100% of FPL.
Race/Ethnicity	37% White, 51% Black, 10% Hispanic.	71% White, 14% Black/African-American, 3% Asian; 18% Hispanic or Latino origin.
Gender/Age	66% female / Average age = 36.	Not given / Average age = 48.
Type of household	Mean number of household members = 2.3; household structure: families (54%), ABAWDs (24%), and elderly/disabled (22%).	57% had 1 or 2 members; 13% had 5 or more members. 41% had children under 21 living in the household.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	497 (831)	401 (5,000)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM (time reference period adjusted to period 12-24 months after FSP exit in 1997, on average)	FSCM
Additional items	Employment, income, participation in public assistance programs, material hardships, demographics.	Demographic information, food and nutrition program participation, emergency food use.
Survey translated?		Spanish.
Sampling and data collection design	Interview sample of 831 households heads drawn from stratified random sample of 10,001 leavers that left FSP in 1997 and remained off for 2 consecutive months. ABAWDS oversampled. Sample weights created to adjust for oversampling and nonresponse. Administrative records used for information on sample members' monthly receipt of public assistance and quarterly earnings. Interviews conducted about 2 years after FSP exit.	Randomized digit dial telephone list generated for households within RI's 41 poverty census tracts (1990 Census). When households were contacted by phone, interviewers requested to speak to household head, defined as the person usually responsible for buying household food. Interviews were only completed if the head of the household was available at that time.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Not specified.	Respondents contacted via telephone at home.
Interviewers	Not specified.	Department of Health staff and volunteers.
Other features		• This is the 2nd annual report of the Rhode Island Food Security Monitoring Project, allowing comparisons with 1999 survey.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	2000 OREGON POPULATION SURVEY	IOWA FAMILIES THAT LEFT TANF
Researchers	Office of Economic Analysis, OR Dept. of Administrative Services and OR Progress Board	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Release date (study period)	January 2001 (Spring – Summer 2000)	February 2001 (February – June 2000)
Location	Oregon	Iowa
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	Random sample of general Oregon population	Single-parent families that received FIP benefits in April, May, and June 1999, but not in July or August 1999.
Annual Income	Median household income in 1999 = $38,700	Average *monthly* income = $1,440
Race/Ethnicity	Not given.	81% White; 16% racial/ethnic minority
Gender/Age	Not given.	93% female / Average age = 30.
Type of household	Not given.	15% married and living with spouse; 17% cohabiting with unmarried partner; 40% residing in urban counties; average household size = 4.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	3,633 households containing 8,904 individuals.	401 (535)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	"Short Form"	"Short Form" (time reference period adjusted to period since exiting FIP (8 to 12 months).
Additional items	Income, demographics, health, opinions on traffic, environmental conditions, transportation, crime, and government services.	Employment status, participation in government and private assistance programs, income, standard of living, housing, and health insurance.
Survey translated?	Not specified.	Not specified.
Sampling and data collection design	Sample derived from random digit sample representative of entire "telephone household" population, including new and unlisted numbers. Target set of at least 400 interviews from each of Oregon's 9 regions. Number of interviews per county based on county population as a percent of regional population. "Sample extensions" conducted to increase sample sizes for African Americans, Asian American, Native Americans, and Hispanics. Adult with most recent birthday selected as respondent. Interviewers attempted to reach target respondent at least 3 times. Calls made between 4:00 – 9:00 p.m. on weekdays, 10:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and Noon – 6:00 p.m. on Sundays.	Sampling frame for telephone survey consisted of 958 single-parent families that left FIP in July or August 1999 after receiving benefits in April, May, and June. 100 families randomly selected for pretest of survey, and 535 for actual survey. Letters sent to sample members before telephone contact. Additional mailings sent and calls made to sample members not responding to initial letter. 3 weeks before end of survey, mailing sent alerting sample of increased participation incentive payment. Interviews conducted 8 – 12 months after leaving FIP.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Telephone survey.	Telephone survey.
Interviewers	Interviewers at in-house telephone facility affiliated with survey firm in Portland. Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing System used to enhance quality control and minimize data entry error.	Trained MPR interviewers.
Other features	• Survey administered by Bardsley & Neidhart Inc., Portland, OR. • Random digit sample purchased from Strategic Sampling, Inc.	• Respondents given $25 incentive to participate. Incentive payment increased to $25 plus $15 gift certificate 3 weeks before end of survey. • Survey designed to take 35 – 40 minutes.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	HUNGER IN SCHENECTADY COUNTY	CUYAHOGA COUNTY'S WELFARE LEAVERS
Researchers	Council of Community Services of New York State, Inc.	Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Case Western Reserve University
Release date (study period)	March 2001 (April – December 2000)	April 2001 (September 1999 – April 2000)
Location	Schenectady County, New York	Cuyahoga County, Ohio
RESPONDENTS		
Target group	General county residents and users of food assistance programs.	Single, female adult parents whose welfare cases closed in the 3rd quarter of 1998 for at least 2 consecutive months.
Annual Income	*General population respondents*: < $15,000 = 16%; $15,000 - $30,000=24%; $30,000 - $50,000=28%; >$50,000=32%. *Emergency food assistance clients*: <$5,000=38%; $5,000 - $10,000=25%; $10,000 - $15,000= 16%; >$15,000 = 21%.	Average monthly household income: $1,169 (61% of income from earnings).
Race/Ethnicity	*General population respondents*: 80% White; 10% African-American; 3% Hispanic; 2% Asian. *Emergency food assistance clients*: 66% White; 22% African-American; 5% Hispanic; 1% Asian.	71% Black
Gender/Age	*General population respondents*: Not given / 33% under 40, 48% 40-59; 19% 60 or older. *Emergency food assistance clients*: 60% female / 18% under 30, 31% 30-39, 35% 40-59, and 16% 60 or older.	100% female; mean age=31
Type of household	***General population respondents:*** 43% of respondents from households with children; 35% of households had 2 people, 19% 3 and 4, and 12% with 6 or more household members. *Emergency food assistance clients*: 45% of respondents from households with children; 21% of households had 2 people, 14% 3, 12% 4, 19% 5 or more.	100% single-women households; average number of children = 1.8.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	Telephone survey: 227 (1,800); In-person survey: 120 (not given); nutrition assessment: 105 (not given).	306 (385)
INSTRUMENT & METHOD		
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM	"Short Form" (30-day reference period)
Additional items	24-hour diet-recall survey, attitudes about hunger and food programs, demographics.	Reasons for leaving and returning to welfare, job characteristics, income, housing, material well-being.
Survey translated?	Not specified.	Not specified.

Sampling and data collection design	*Telephone interviewers* called pre-screened telephone numbers up to 4 times, "or until a determination of outcome was reached." Administered 37-item questionnaire (including FSCM). *In-person interviews* conducted with clients at 5 soup kitchens and food pantries. Potential respondents approached and asked if they wanted to volunteer to participate in the survey. 105 nutrition assessments conducted at 4 of the food pantry sites. Assessment consisted of 24-hour diet-recall survey. Recalls analyzed using diet analysis software.	• From the 1998 exit cohort, 385 case heads selected to participate in a follow-up survey. Interviews conducted approximately 14-21 months after exit. • Survey findings weighted to compensate for fact that older recipients, with more months on welfare, were more likely to be selected for survey. • In addition to follow-up survey, 3rd quarter 1996 and 1998 leaver cohorts compared using administrative data (n=2,794 and 3,357, respectively.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	Local soup kitchens and food pantries (5)	Primarily telephone interviews, with in-person interviews for those who could not be reached by phone.
Interviewers	Telephone and in-person surveys conducted by students from Union College Department of Sociology and staff members at 1 food assistance site. Cornell Cooperative Extension of Schenectady County conducted the nutrition assessment.	Subcontracted by MDRC.
Other features	• Emergency food assistance clients offered milk coupon as a participation incentive. Participants in the nutrition assessment were given milk coupon and outdoor grill tool. • Focus groups conducted with emergency food providers, Food Stamp Program and WIC participants, food pantry users, and seniors.	

TECHNICAL SUMMARIES OF STATE AND LOCAL FOOD SECURITY STUDIES
1997 – May 2001

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	FOOD SECURITY AND COMMUNITY IN HARTFORD, CT
Researchers	Hartford Food System
Release date (study period)	May 2001 (May – October 1999)
Location	Hartford, Connecticut
RESPONDENTS	
Target group	Households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Hartford.
Annual Income	Median household income = $13,000
Race/Ethnicity	47% Hispanic; 44% Black; 6% White
Gender/Age	Not given.
Type of household	87% rented their apartment; 27% spent at least half of their income on rent; 29% spent over 30% of their income on food; 18% did not have a working telephone; 58% did not have an adult employed full-time; 55% did not own a car; 42% with no adult member with a high school degree.
No. of interviews completed (sample size)	330
INSTRUMENT & METHOD	
FSCM/"Short Form"/Other	FSCM
Additional items	Social capital, participation in public and private food programs, food shopping behavior, fruit and vegetable consumption (Block Screening Questionnaire used), and household demographics.
Survey translated?	Not specified.
Sampling and data collection design	Interviewers went door-to-door to obtain random sample of households below 185% of federal poverty level. Focus group discussions also conducted.
Type of survey site (number of sites)	In-person interviews (respondents' homes)
Interviewers	Up to 10 trained interviewers.
Other features	• Respondents paid $5 for their participation. • Survey pretested.

Center on Hunger and Poverty
Heller Graduate School • Brandeis University
Mailstop 077 • Waltham, MA 02454-9110
Phone 781-736-8885 • Fax 781-736-3925
hunger@brandeis.edu • http://www.centeronhunger.org